

A
NEW THEORY
OF
REDEMPTION,

UPON PRINCIPLES EQUALLY AGREEABLE TO
REVELATION *and* REASON.

“In our Religion, as in the Arts and Sciences, there still is,
“and probably will continue to be, room for Enquiry, and need
“of Illustration; and he who humbly Enquires with a sincere
“Desire to know the Truth and do good by explaining it, will
“ever have Room to rejoice in his Labours, as contributing no
“less to his own Happiness and Virtue, than to that of
“Mankind.

BEATTIE.

VOL. II.

LONDON: PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR,
And sold by G. G. J. and J. ROBINSON, and T. CADELL, *London*;
S. HAZARD, *Bath*; W. BULGIN, and E. SHIERCLIFF, *Bristol*.

M,DCC,LXXXIX.

(ENTERED AT STATIONER'S HALL.)

3



C O N T E N T S.

CHAPTER.

PAGE

B O O K II.

IV. *Philosophical Solution of the Facts demonstrated from Nature, and many other Particulars revealed in Scripture.* — — — 1

V. *Difficulties of the Moral System explained and obviated.* — 110

VI. *Review of King's Origin of Evil.* 159

B O O K III.

On the Changes of Divine Providence at the Fall; their natural relation to each other, and universal tendency to Redemption.

I. *On the Increase of Issue.* — 273

II. *On the Obligation of Labour entailed on Man.* — — 282

III. *On the Subjection of the Woman.* 310

VOL. II.

A 2

IV.

IV. *On Pain.* — — — 326

V. *On Death and other Circumstances
relating to the Institution of it.* 340

VI. *Exposition of some Texts and other
Miscellaneous Matters relating
to Redemption.* — — 388

ERRATA.

Page 20, line 14, *for* conforming *read* enforcing p. 21, l. 19,
f. established *r.* establish. P. 36, l. 24. f. that was *r.*
that it was. P. 60, l. 7, f. by *r.* but. P. 66, l. 10, f.
prosperity *r.* propriety. P. 81, l. 8, f. whole world *r.* all
nature. P. 95, l. 4, f. last *r.* least. P. 112, l. 11, f. every
r. very. 213, l. 3, insert *as* before God. P. 213, l. 19, *r.*
from its ingredients form. P. 246, l. 22, f. the circle *r.* the
whole circle. P. 271, l. 4, *dele* the comma, and, if any after
scarce. P. 304, l. 2, f. in *r.* to. P. 311, l. 6, f. Mosaic *r.*
Mosaic account. P. 320, l. 19, f. vessels *r.* vassals. P. 356,
l. 10, f. we now *r.* we have now. P. 398. l. 15, f. These
r. There. l. 25, *dele* have. P. 399, l. 7, f. bounty *r.* beau-
ty. P. 440, l. 5, f. proved *r.* procured.

BOOK

BOOK II.

CHAPTER IV.

PHILOSOPHICAL SOLUTION OF THE FACTS
DEMONSTRATED FROM NATURE, AND
MANY OTHER PARTICULARS REVEALED
IN SCRIPTURE.

EVERY circumstance required to complete the doctrine of Redemption has, I trust, in the preceding volume been distinctly proved; the corruption of nature in one single pair by breach of an original law ordained them, the penalty that all mankind became obnoxious to in pursuance of this, the extraordinary dispensation from it and necessity of as extraordinary means for the deliverance are not more expressly revealed in scripture than they have been shewn deducible from fundamental principles of nature. These are all the particulars of Redemption, concerning

VOL. II. B

cerning the truth of which misapprehension has hitherto made all the mystery; and since when duly represented they authenticate themselves, I might have availed myself of this if I had chosen it without any further solution or account of them. As to the pretence of incredibility that God should endure so foul a lapse as that supposed of Adam (when besides its natural obnoxiousness to his purity it must also involve him in the necessity of such infinite atonement for it) this cannot but fall to the ground of course after such experimental evidence of fact. The objection only serves to shew the precariousness of theory, however specious in itself, and the superior confidence that should ever be placed in history. However extraordinary an account may seem, this is no just reason for rejecting reputable information; but should we even suppose the relation so surprizing as to shake all faith of positive testimony whatever, yet there is no resisting of this when it is coupled with the plainest evidence of sense and Reason. The things that

that originally appear least likely in themselves make the deepest impression on us when properly established; that such mean and illiterate instruments for instance as the Apostles should subdue the power, the pride and prejudice of the world was what could not antecedently be imagined, but when fulfilled contained the strongest evidence of their Divine commission. In like manner this astonishing Redemption is what could never have been supposed without being seen, but when it is seen is not to be contradicted or denied; and however surprising it may seem in speculation that God should bestow so immense a price in favour of a system apparently so unworthy of him, yet when the fundamental difficulty of his enduring its depravity must be admitted, and the satisfaction of Christ is thus admirably adapted afterward to remove the objection from his purity, the establishment of the latter follows a fortiori from the necessary circumstance and foundation of the former. The two great mysteries of sin and satisfaction (as

they have hitherto been represented) by these means contribute to reconcile and remove the difficulty of each other; the learned would be happy to find an equal opportunity of solving many intricate matters of much less importance than the depravity of mankind from history, for there are various remains of antiquity that like this are utterly inexplicable from conjecture, which some particular relation of their original would perfectly unravel; and there are also many accounts in history that like the satisfaction appear incredible in themselves, which correspondent effects in nature would establish beyond a doubt. It can be no way essential then for me to shew why God decreed this stupendous dispensation toward fallen man in preference to any other plan that might have been pursued; it suffices for the truth of scripture, that I have proved the account it gives in every particular, and that there is no other supposition which coincides so well with the plain phænomena of nature and perfection of its Author. But tho' I am not at
all

all obliged for the honour of Revelation to shew the final cause of our Redemption, after having so fully proved the fact; yet as I conceive that very sufficient Reason may be given why God determined not to follow any other system (either by destroying our first parents on their fall, and substituting a new pair instead of them, or by preventing their lapse originally) and it will amply magnify the wisdom of Providence to do this; I shall now pursue the philosophical solution of the matter, and endeavour to satisfy the reader as to every enquiry that can be made on this head.

With regard to the first question then, viz. why God annihilated not our first parents immediately on their transgression, we may in some measure learn the Reason of this from the design of Satan in seducing them; I shall therefore enlarge particularly on the latter, as it may contribute to illustrate and set off the former; darkness occasions light to shine more conspicuously, and each of these schemes will re-
present

present its opposite in a more striking view by the contrast that subsists between them.

The plan of the serpent was to involve the whole human race at that time comprehended in the existence of a single pair; and since man was the principal creature for whom this sublunary world was formed, the fate of the latter might reasonably have been expected from the subversion of the former, for whose end and purpose it was chiefly ordained and constituted. In short the intention of Satan was to undo, as far as in him lay, the works that the Creator had so lately made and now so much delighted in; and indeed his scheme appears as well contrived as it could be for the purpose. But how impotent is malice, how narrow and circumscribed is stratagem when compared with real wisdom and perfection? The destruction of man on transgression of the original law was not more obvious than the power of God to replace him in an instant, so that nothing could be more insignificant and contemptible
as

as well as odious and detestable than this design in itself; but it is always incident to the nature of sin to contain an equal proportion of folly in it, and the present compleatly favours of the diabolical spirit and disposition of revenge, which not only rejoices at iniquity where it can reap no prospect of advantage, but also triumphs to display its weakness where it can only irritate and cannot accomplish any real detriment to the party it would injure. Thus, tho' the tempter could not think of effecting any essential or material evil to the great Creator, but might justly expect to draw down tenfold vengeance on himself, yet the meer manifestation of his enmity and provocation of the Almighty was sufficient inducement to a being of his description for acting as he did; the idea that we conceive of him in general is highly sustained in this particular, nor has he wanted sons among mankind to propagate the resemblance of him.

But

But with how striking a lustre do the attributes of God shine forth in opposition to this plot of darkness, who determines not to execute the fate denounced on man, since he was circumvented by a superior adversary, and the accomplishment of this was the end the chief apostate aimed at! The Supreme Being therefore reserves the latter in everlasting chains unto the judgement of the great day with resolution to rescue the race that he proposed to ruin, and retort the destruction he designed for others with redoubled vengeance on his own head. God might have justly condemned both the deceiver and the deceived indeed, if he had chosen it, but in acting as he did he much more eminently displayed the riches of his grace and wisdom; viz. in confounding the councils of the former and ordaining him to irretrievable perdition, but dispensing pardon to the latter tho' not without sufficient satisfaction and security against disobedience for ever after. There cannot be a more striking contrast of wickedness and wisdom, of folly

folly and perfection than the foregoing;
the conduct of God is a glorious pattern
for his vicegerents on earth to imitate, as
far as they are able, in all cases of rebel-
lion.

I am happy to find this way of thinking
in the great Milton, who, in his third book
of Paradise Lost, introduces the Son ad-
dressing the Father thus :

Or shall the adversary thus obtain
His end, and frustrate thine? Shall he fulfil
His malice & thy goodness bring to nought?
Or proud return, tho' to his heavier doom,
Yet with revenge accomplish'd, and to Hell
Draw after him the whole race of mankind
By him corrupted? Or wilt thou thyself
Abolish thy creation, and unmake
For him what for thy glory thou hast made?
So should thy goodness & thy greatness both
Be questioned and blasphemed without
defence.

C

I am

I am the more pleased with this passage, as it conveys, perhaps, the first hint that was ever given of the principle that our scheme is founded on, viz. that of abolishing mankind in case of not vouchsafing their Redemption; tho' in one respect it widely differs from our hypothesis, which is in making the supposed event not the regular effect of the law, but an extraordinary interposition of the Almighty for its prevention. Milton's idea of what would have ensued in ordinary course was evidently Calvinistical; it shews however his great force and strength of mind, that while he was under the influence of this prejudice from misinterpretation of the Scripture, he should from Reason form the notion of a more equitable proceeding, and pitch upon that very circumstance for an extra-judicial measure, which the letter of the law itself (had it been rightly understood) would have recommended to him.

But

But to proceed with the enquiry; it may be objected, perhaps, that however the foregoing account may pass as a poetical imagination, it will by no means appear sufficient to a philosophical enquirer, and seems a much more satisfactory solution of the design of Satan in seducing our first parents, than it does of God in saving them. For whatever meanness may be suitable to the character of the tempter, it was every way unbecoming that of the the Supreme Being to make such a creature of so much importance, as to degrade himself in so extraordinary a manner, merely to disappoint the other of his purpose. Could it have been done without any such stupendous sacrifice on the part of God, or dire consequence of sin to man, the motive might have been admitted; but when this was impossible upon the plan pursued, and both inconveniences might have been avoided by destroying our first parents and substituting a new pair instead of them (whereby every end of government and goodness in their crea-

tion would have been completely answered as before) it seems weakness instead of wisdom to reject this method, for no better purpose than to defeat the fiend. Or if it must be deemed of such mighty and essential consequence to deprive him of his aim, this might have been accomplished a much easier way, viz. by supporting our first parents with supernatural grace from falling on this extraordinary occasion; which would have been much more agreeable both to the wisdom and goodness of the Supreme Being, than thus to descend from his eternal Godhead, and at the same time suffer so much detriment to his creatures.

In answer to this it must be confessed, that we are far from having arrived as yet at the ultimate end of the Divine proceeding; the meer disappointment of the tempter is too insignificant a circumstance to be looked upon as its final object, nor however diminutive this may be deemed
in

in itself, can it appear more so than it will in comparison with the full end and meaning of Redemption when it comes to be displayed. The present however may be mentioned as an occasional consideration by the way, especially when it coincides with infinitely greater motives; in unfolding which I must beg leave to pursue a different course from that of the objection, beginning where it ends, and enquiring first into the reasons that determined God against interposing originally with his Almighty power; which will lead us directly forward to a solution of every other circumstance in question, and shew the advantage of the scheme pursued over any other that can possibly be mentioned.

As to the motives then that may be presumed to have hindered God from the exertion of his omnipotence in favour of mankind, these may be collected from his original design in making them, and from the same considerations as determined him against suffering offenders to escape without

out punishment or atonement. For why were our first parents raised out of lifeless dust, inspired with understanding, and endued with the power of motion in the beginning? That they might think and act for themselves, thus fulfilling their own proper end; to which nothing could have been a greater contradiction than never to leave them to their own conduct and direction. Men might have as well continued in the state of insensibility they were exalted by the bounty of their Creator from, if notwithstanding the extraordinary faculties conferred upon them, they must still be managed upon the principles of meer machines, as if they had no power to regulate themselves. A possibility of deviating from their end must ever be incident to free, subordinate, and finite agents; but if Omnipotence must always be immediately at hand for its prevention, they never are to be confided to themselves, and nothing could have been more superfluous than their creation. It would have been much worse than if the sun, the moon,

moon, and stars, had all been made for the meer purpose of this earth; for in such case they would have answered some end however inadequate to themselves, and next to nothing when compared with what might have been expected from them. But on the present supposition far nobler beings than all the heavenly bodies would have absolutely been made for nothing; much brighter luminaries of the creation, those that were ordained to reflect the image and perfection of the divine person, would have been meer non-entities as to any use in nature. It is true the assistance of the Holy Ghost is promised to all such as sincerely ask it now, but why? On account of the fall and declension of our nature, whereby we are rendered in great degree incapable of acting as we should; since God has been pleased to tolerate this corrupt condition of being, he never fails to support his frail, if faithful creatures with requisite supplies of grace; but he by no means encourages any undue presumption on his assistance now, our only right to expect

pect or pray for it is when we suitably employ our own endeavours, and it was utterly withholden from our first parents, because neither sin nor Satan had acquired any undue dominion over them; their nature was perfectly free from both, and had no excuse for subjecting itself to either. In fine, God treats his creatures in conformity with their several natures, the inanimate he entirely actuates, and the weak he strengthens; but leaves those that are sufficient to themselves, to be wholly accountable for their own conduct. Nor is his wisdom less conspicuous in the last than either of the foregoing instances, in ordaining nothing that is superfluous than every thing that is required; for whether creatures that are duly qualified to support themselves presume that they shall not be permitted to fall or not be punished if they do; it will probably prove much the same with regard to the use of those moral powers they were created for the right employment of. Children are no less apt to abuse the idea of unlimited

unlimited assistance in their parents than offenders are of lenity in magistrates, and the consequence of unbounded confidence of supply in one case, is no less dangerous than that of mercy in the other; the same considerations therefore that restrained the Deity from suffering the guilty to escape without punishment or equivalent, were of equal force to hinder him from interposing with his omnipotence for the prevention of disobedience. The example would have been of equal prejudice to the due exercise of the extraordinary talents committed to them, and have destroyed the end for which punishment was ordained, as much as impunity on transgression without atonement.

It has been said that God might have supported our first parents with an invincible supply of grace, and hindered them *secretly* by his omnipotence from falling; so that neither they nor any other creatures in the universe should have ever known any thing of his interposition, or seen any

example to make an improper use and advantage of. But this a still more exorbitant and criminal imagination, if possible, than the foregoing; viz. that when God had done every thing that was requisite to qualify his creatures for their own conduct it was not sufficient, but he was bound continually to support them afterward in the same manner as if there had been no such ability conferred upon them. According to the present improvement of the scheme however the Almighty must have been the deceiver as well as drudge of all moral beings, and not only stooped to the grossest servitude, but added the much greater baseness of falshood to it; by giving them the most solemn assurance of their senses that they are made for their own direction, and obliged at their peril to depend on their own conduct, when they are not and there is nothing farther from possibility than their fall. The former is necessary to give them any concern or care whatever concerning what they do, and the latter it seems to provide
against

against its failure; but how vile an expectation this from him who glories in the sacred name of truth, to lay an imposition on the faculties of all intellectual beings, and violate the veracity of his whole creation?

Nor would such proceeding have been more unworthy of his honour than his wisdom, since however secretly it might have been carried on it must have been repugnant to the end for which moral agents were ordained, and have made the noblest the most nugatory of all his works. For as I said before the Supreme Being might have as well created them meer machines in the beginning, as thus bestowed the supernatural gifts of understanding and power upon them to no purpose; which he must have done, if it were necessary for him continually to sustain them afterward in the same manner as if there were no such talents conferred upon them. His own brightest qualities would at this rate have been entirely thrown away, and

the objects they were annexed to of no more excellency than dead matter in the creation. The sole question to be determined in the present case is, whether it were best, all things considered to make any beings of such nature as free agents; this can only be decided by their final event and consequence, which I think has not been sufficiently considered, but hope will be duly illustrated in the sequel. In the mean while taking the rectitude of their creation for granted I maintain, that if the Supreme Being were justifiable in making them, he certainly was in conforming the end that they were made for; and nothing could have been more repugnant to his wisdom as well as veracity, than to do the former of these without the latter. There is one advantage however to be drawn even from the contrary expectation, viz. to shew how necessary it is for the supreme lawgiver to guard against all possibility of such presumption on him; to assure his creatures by an example of the most extraordinary nature, that
 he

he will rather endure any extreme than gratify it either by preventing the misapplication of their talents or suffering it to go unpunished; and that nothing but a careful employment of their trust, or completion of the end for which they were ordained can ever be depended on for their security and welfare.

This his wonderful condescension to the sacrifice of his Son accomplishes, and not to say any thing of the unworthiness of the contrary conduct in the Supreme Being, or baseness of such an expectation from him; the tendency thereof is obviously to undo, at least never to improve, that of the plan pursued to compleat the noblest works of the creation; to make moral beings in reality what they were made for, and established them for ever on the true principle and foundation of their nature. That is a miserable expedient which is only calculated to serve a single purpose and without continual repetition affords no provision against the like event
tho'

tho' it is ever liable to be in future. God is to govern an innumerable host of creatures throughout eternity, and the possibility of violating their allegiance is always inseparable from their nature ; if the departure from this had not happened when it did, it is scarce credible that it never would have been the case with any of them afterward, consequently the prevention of it by secret force would have only served a momentary end ; been a present prop, if I may be allowed the expression, without any lasting use or advantage to the creation, while the most latent supposition of any such proceeding must have tended to its utter ruin and confusion. If the Supreme Being were determined to communicate the image of his own perfection to his moral creatures, to make them truly what he meant them, viz. self-sufficient and immortal under him on the basis of their own nature, it was evidently necessary to pursue a contrary conduct ; to root out all possible presumption of any such prevarication in his government, and
to

to convince them by their fall that he will not be mocked, or by any means disappointed of their end. If the scheme of a moral constitution in itself be worthy of the Creator, which must be determined by the event and will further be considered in the sequel, this prosecution of it by the most proper and indeed only effectual means cannot but redound highly to the credit of his wisdom. In the mean while I must embrace the present opportunity of observing to the honour of truth and scandal of falsehood, how inseparably the former is connected with the welfare of all moral beings even where a departure from it seems most expedient for them; while the latter, however salutary for a time it may appear, necessarily tends to their detriment and disadvantage, not to say depravation and ruin; there cannot be a greater illustration of each of these particulars than the foregoing.

But still it may be urged perhaps, that tho' God could not prevent the fall of
free

free agents by absolute restraint, more than arbitrarily dispense with their punishment upon transgression, consistently with his essential truth and wisdom in their creation; or however necessary it might be even to establish an extraordinary precedent against all such presumption, yet there was no occasion for permitting the temptation of our first parents by Satan in order to this. The previous condemnation of him and his numerous host to the destiny ordained for them at the day of judgment would have answered every purpose to be expected from Redemption, and have as effectually taught all moral beings not to depend on impunity or prevention of disobedience as any atonement can do for deliverance; the only end of this being to supply the place of a condign execution and punishment of the guilty. Why then was not the tempter consigned to his fate before he had accomplished such devastation and ruin in the creation? The mischief he meant for others would have been thereby much more compleatly retorted

retorted on himself than it can be now, when besides the consequence of so much temporal sin and evil he will also involve such multitudes of mankind in eternal perdition with him. Was it not enough that he had already seduced a numerous host of Angels, but he must be permitted to make so many inferior beings likewise the companions of his fate, as will be notwithstanding this stupendous scheme for their Redemption? If the disappointment of his end were aimed at, it cannot but appear at last a miserable contrivance as well as broken triumph; for tho' it were contrary to the fundamental laws of liberty and truth to hinder the fall of our first parents by extraordinary interposition even for a moment, yet the seasonable execution and removal of offenders who are certain to promote no other end than evil has always been judged incumbent upon every wise and perfect Ruler. The Almighty should have laid his restraint on Satan, if he could not on Adam; there was as much obligation to the former as objection

to the latter, and this not only appears from Reason but is even confirmed by Revelation which informs us that after the consummation the thing proposed will be fulfilled; Satan will then by an everlasting decree be banished from the regions of the faithful, and never be allowed the most distant possibility of access afterward to injure or corrupt the blessed. What then could induce the Deity to expose mankind to the machinations of so superior an adversary who had already been the occasion of ruin to much higher beings and whom it was infallibly foreknown that men would fall by! Nothing less indeed could be expected from the disparity of the trial, and whatever may be said for the necessity of freedom there cannot be any thing for permitting such extraordinary temptation as mankind were not apparently equal to contend with. Here then may be objected the question that before was urged concerning purity of nature, why was not that ordained in the beginning which is adjudged so necessary

necessary in the conclusion? If this were justly asked as to the perfection of the species, why not of equal force with regard to the proper precaution for its security? The original appointment of the former can only serve to condemn the omission of the latter; for had the same provision been made for the protection of our nature from extraordinary danger that was for the ordinary attainment of its end (which is from fatal experience found to be equally expedient in itself) there would have been no occasion for this stupendous system of Redemption, but every thing would have been as well secured without it. There cannot be a doubt of this, so far as we may believe the promised safety of the saints hereafter, when the very thing proposed will be performed; the non-execution of it therefore in the beginning is a paradox that must be resolved into the strangest oversight and supineness. Yea had proper care been only taken to guard mankind from the approach of the tempt-

er for a season, viz. till the race was propagated, however he might afterward have prevailed on some to violate their allegiance, he could not probably on all; and those that remained might have supplied the place of the disobedient by future generation. But the permitting of him to assail them after this manner in their original, whereby the whole species became involved, seems hardly reconcilable with any thing but a determined purpose of exposing them to the utmost consequences of sin and evil. Thus every expedient fails at last of fairly solving this extravagant proceeding of Redemption, and instead of extinguishing the difficulty only removes it one step farther back, which when you pursue it to the mystery remains as great to all intents and purposes as it was before.

This is the utmost objection I presume that can be urged, and leads us to the last stage of enquiry, or ne plus ultra there is no possibility of passing; which I
the

the more willingly enter into as it will not only prove the wisdom of providence in one particular, but in a great variety of important articles that have never been yet so clearly comprehended. The absolute necessity of sin and evil, and ultimate end of God in suffering them for a season; the advantage of Redemption to the future security of the saints in Heaven and even of the Angels who kept their first estate, with the exigency of excluding those who fell from partaking in its benefit will I trust receive a further exposition from this enquiry than has hitherto been given them. It will collect all the rays of Redemption into one point of view, and by illustrating the whole scheme together, cast an ample light on many of the most abstruse doctrines of religion; which men are usually referred to a future state, and to superior beings for further satisfaction in.

Had

Had Satan been punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord before the propagation of mankind, which must have been the case had it been done before their fall, the race at large could not have been witnesses of his fate or capable of profiting by his example; as they will be at the last day, when all with their own eyes shall see him driven from the regions of the blessed and from the glory of the Almighty.

Nor would his previous condemnation have otherwise been of such lasting use and efficacy as the suffering of mankind to be corrupted by him, and procuring of eternal Redemption for them. God would have consulted their present ease, but by no means their perpetual safety by preserving them from temptation, so much as by exposing them to fall thereby and for a time delivering them up to the consequence; for hereby they are taught the necessary evil of sin in the
most

most convincing manner, and cannot but be forever secured (if any moral means will suffice) in obedience for the future. The calamity which happened to our first parents was such as they must have been always subject to incur; Satan even without temptation fell from a much higher dignity of being, consequently no original perfection of nature could have secured mankind from possibility of the like disaster. We are not to consider his absence, or removal, but the example of his condemnation and the experimental sense of evil men will for ever retain from sin as the efficient means to make them in the end more perfect than he was in the beginning, and render the obedience of all the saints eternal. For when creatures have been permitted to taste the baneful poison of corruption and after that restored by the most transcendant means to righteousness, this must be a vast, additional preservative against sin in future; if any provision that is short of direct necessity and suitable to the dignity

nity of exalted creatures can serve to make purity everlasting, it must be this. I therefore conclude that men, tho', they may always remain inferior in station to many other created beings, will enjoy a considerable advantage over them in this particular; pain is the most powerful of all preventives, and experimental knowledge of evil the best expedient not only to reclaim the fallen but also to establish and confirm the righteous. No perfection of nature that is not absolute and supreme seems capable of standing without this prerogative on so substantial and sound a basis; the remembrance of that sin and sorrow we so sadly labour under in the present life must ever be a mighty increase both to our happiness and its security in the next.

This appears to be the meaning of what St. Paul says when he tells us, that it behoved God to make the Captain of our Salvation perfect through suffering; Heb. 2, 10. Christ was originally a
Lamb

Lamb without spot or blemish, yet notwithstanding this and his having vanquished Satan, affliction was expedient to compleat his human nature; as it was necessary that he should be exempt from sin himself, so was it that he should taste the bitter fruit thereof in its extreme from others; without this the Captain of our salvation, tho' he was of the most untainted purity and had in every other respect endured the utmost trial, would hereafter have been less perfect than the sons he led to glory.

Here then was a great advantage gained by permission of the fall which could not have been obtained without it; judgement might have been executed on Satan, but besides that mankind could not have profited by the example of his final condemnation from the presence of the Lord, as they will by being spectators and eye-witnesses of the event themselves, men could never have been endowed with so strong a sense of the necessity of obedience on its own account, as by enduring

variety of evil in their own person from violation of it. This is the most effectual method to inspire a natural detestation and abhorrence of sin in itself, a circumstance of equal importance with the certainty of judicial punishment; the noblest and most coercive arguments to righteousness are such as manifest it not only the condition of our welfare by particular institution, but necessary qualification for it in the nature of things; nor is the sanction of any positive command or penalty perhaps so cogent a motive to obedience, as a thorough sense of the intrinsic excellency of virtue and its unavoidable obligation to our happiness.

This instruction I say could never have been so amply conveyed to men as by experience of the opposite effect of pain from sin, and that the design of God was such in permitting this corrupt estate is further evident to me from hence; that the kingdom of Heaven might have been long since restored, there was no occasion for so flow
and

and dilatory a prosecution of Redemption, had not the Deity thought the continuance of the present method best and most advantageous for us. For the Atonement might have been much sooner made, and the law being thereby fully satisfied, nothing more was requisite than the Divine will and pleasure in order to the recovery and restitution of our nature; the trumpet of the arch-angle might have sounded thereupon to judgement, and the world been immediately renewed in its original glory and perfection. If the number of the blessed were not accomplished, this would have been no objection, since it might afterward have been fulfilled in the same manner as if the fall had never happened, viz. by increase from innocent and upright beings. But the same Reason that induced the Divine Being not to destroy our first parents on their transgression and substitute a new pair instead of them, disposed him after their corruption had once been propagated to continue it till the end of all things; for the more are

obliged to pass through the purgatorial fire and ordeal as I may say, of sin, the better will the conclusion be. The rankest poison when duly corrected and applied is often found the most salutary and efficacious medicine; in like manner depravity which is now our sorest grievance will be our best preservative in Heaven; the remembrance of its dire effects and dismal tragedies can never be expunged or razed out of our conception, which will be a charm to render us everlasting proof against possibility of sin hereafter.

Hence it also cannot but be obvious why the temptation of the Devil was permitted to succeed so soon after the creation of mankind, and in the very infancy as I may say of nature. There was the same cause for this as for ordaining the continuance of the present state (after it had once begun) to the end of all things, viz. that every one might be partaker of the fall, and the whole system seasoned with its benefit; there being no doubt that was designed by
 God

God for the perfection as it was by Satan for the ruin of the human race. We are apt to imagine that the event which happened was the worst that ever could have been, since if our first parents had escaped till the propagation of others in innocence, the whole species could not afterward have been affected by their disobedience; the consequence would have only reached themselves, who might have been easily removed and the race of mankind supplied by generation from those that remained in righteousness.

But that which we are apt to esteem the worst was in reality the best event that could have ever happened, and in all probability intended as such; since if the whole system could not otherwise have been injured by them for a season, it never could have been established in all its parts so thoroughly as by the present method; each and every one of which will be absolutely secured throughout Eternity thereby. And that the final perfection of the blessed by an experimental

rimental sense of evil as well as good was the ultimate end of God in permitting this mixt estate I am convinced, not only from the nature of the thing itself but also from the denomination of that very circumstance by transgression of which it was occasioned. This was stiled the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, and the name thereof implies it designed for the purpose mentioned; which reminds me of another objection that occurred to me before while I was enlarging on the importance of the prohibition with regard to it and the goodness of God in forewarning man so solemnly against it, viz. that if it were so pernicious as I represented in its nature why was it placed in Paradise at all? To which I now answer, for the direct end that it might be violated and man by the fatal effects of disobedience taught the necessity of the contrary virtue so as to be invested with immortality beyond reach of danger; after having been sensibly made acquainted with the unavoidable evil

evil of sin as well as happiness of obedience, which was not possible in an original state of innocence and blessedness. That which was of the most baneful will through the blessing of Redemption be endued with the most beneficial quality be made the means of destroying death instead of immortality in man and thus converted into a tree of everlasting life; of infinitely greater value than that at first in Paradise as its effect will actually subsist forever and not depend on any other circumstance to preserve its benefit.

Nor could this *salutary* knowledge of evil have been conveyed by any means but by lapse upon transgression, which shews again why this mixt estate, tho' necessary from the infancy to the consummation of our nature, could not have been properly ordained in the beginning. For if instead of an effect of sin it had been that of God's own appointment in the first place, it could not in this case have been so great a lesson against disobedience. As
man

man in an original state of uprightness and happiness could not have had any experience of evil from sin, so in an original state of imperfection would his knowledge of the former have been comparatively barren and unfruitful; the virtue of evil, as I may say, consisting in its being found the consequence of sin and thereby made to teach intellectual beings the necessity of righteousness, which it could not have done so completely, had it proceeded from any other cause in the beginning. This is the beneficial information derived to us from the fall, viz. that all our grievance (of whatever kind) came by transgression into the world, and that sin is originally the sole detriment of our nature; the solution of evil being most consistent with the perfections of the Divine Being which resolves it wholly into disobedience to him, and affording the most efficacious motives against sin which represents misery as universally proceeded from it.

It

It is no objection that the offence of Adam is not our own, nor is it necessary that the sin we suffer by should be always such; it is enough that this is the only parent of human woe, and that the latter originates not from any other cause, but is ever inseparably connected with it. Thus it was that Christ, tho' he knew not sin, was made perfect by affliction; he was not more sensible of this in itself than that it was occasioned wholly by the other, in which case he was as fully acquainted with the nature of each as if he had experienced both the cause and effect together.

Here I cannot but embrace the opportunity of answering a suggestion that Divines have been considerably perplexed with, viz. that Paradise was made in vain, for it was no sooner made than forfeited and destroyed. The Author of Revelation examined seems very angry at this, for he exclaims; "Is then every thing
"made in vain that is transitory? And
VOL. II. G "did

“ did Paradise vanish in an instant? And
 “ do the Scriptures warrant us to believe
 “ so? Quite the contrary. But suppose
 “ it to have lasted but one day, the ephemeris’s whole life and end of existence
 “ is fully accomplished in a less space;
 “ and yet the infinite wisdom and power
 “ of God are as amply manifested in the
 “ formation of that insect as in the whole
 “ apparatus of Paradise. Suppose it lasted
 “ but a day, it is evident that the whole
 “ scheme of our Redemption is built up
 “ on the transactions of that day, and
 “ is that vain and unworthy of God?
 “ And are you sure it is? And can you
 “ prove it to be so? O arrogance of
 “ mortal vanity! Are the times and seasons
 “ in our hands! And is it ours to
 “ say when and how long! Must our
 “ ideas of duration and estimates of fitness
 “ determine him, with whom a thousand
 “ years are but as one day, and one
 “ day as a thousand years! Wise son
 “ of Sirach, how just is thy reflection!
 “ Wisdom is far from pride. [Vol. 1,
 page 92.]

There

There is too much of declamation and passion, too little of consistency and Reason in this passage. The Author seems determined to secure his point at all events, first by denying the short continuance of Paradise, and afterward maintaining that the state of an ephemeris is long enough for it. But as to the first part of his argument, I think it plain from Revelation that Paradise could not have been of very long duration, or if we look no further than the thing itself, could not have continued to any purpose it was ordained for; since it was clearly forfeited before mankind had made the least increase, or advanced one step toward replenishing the earth. Nor is the comparison of an ephemeris any more consistent with Reason than the foregoing account with Revelation; for not to insist on the insignificancy of the animal to the existence of a world in righteousness, the former continues as long as it was made to last, which cannot be said of Paradise (that was qualified for immortality) on the

supposition of its enduring but a day ; there is no more comparifon between the propofed duration than the importance of the things in queftion. I hope I have purfued a path that is more agreeable to Reafon as well as Scripture, by fhewing the neceffity that Paradife fhould fubfift and (tho' made for immortality) for a fhort feafon only ; which is very confiftent as its inftitution and speedy forfeiture both fo eminently contribute to its final eftablifhment and confirmation. That can never be in vain, if it exift but a moment, which is thus effential to the everlafting kingdom of Heaven.

The fame advantage is there, I truft, of this account concerning the introduction of fin and evil over any that has yet been given. The two great points in reconciling the myftery of their exiftence with the perfection of the Divine Being are to fhew his natural averfion to them, and their neceffity notwithstanding for a feafon, in both which men have hitherto

hitherto been miserably deficient. As to the first particular, it has been sufficiently enlarged upon and the occasion of their failure on it shewn by their being led to pursue a directly opposite conduct to what they should have done. With respect to the last, the difficulty arose in all probability from the same cause, viz. from their inability to consider sin in any other light than as the curse of original condemnation; that it could possibly be of any service to the creation, especially to the everlasting salvation of mankind was a paradox too great to be conceived by them. And yet whatever blasphemy this may seem, I trust it has been demonstrated without any offence to righteousness or the kingdom of Heaven; that which is in itself the greatest evil (because it draws down every other) will finally be productive of the utmost good by constituting its own antidote and bane. This is the very foundation that Heaven is built upon, which without it would be a much greater mystery and paradox than the consistency

cy of depravity with divine perfection ever was; for that there has been disobedience not only in Paradise but Heaven is undeniable according to Revelation, and yet we are by the same authority assured that it never will be after the consummation. What account is to be given of this extraordinary difference then, that a circumstance which has so often happened shall not ensue throughout eternity again? The race will be moral agents as much as ever, nor can their freedom be controuled hereafter more than heretofore, consistently with the fundamental law and end of their creation; how comes it then to pass, that a misfortune which has been incident not only to themselves but to so many superior beings shall never befall any of them more? Can there be so wonderful a difference in the event without a suitable provision in the nature of things? No certainly, the difficulty is to conceive what provision can be sufficient, which experience of the bad effects and consequences

sequences of sin explains or nothing will ; nor can we therefore be at a loss to certify the design and meaning of its permission.

But tho' the efficacy of corruption to correct itself and its necessity to the completion of the most perfect creatures is thus apparent from whatever is past, present, or to come, and there is no accounting for either of the three estates without this prospect of it; (viz. that Paradise should exist so short a time, this world at all and Heaven forever, all which particulars are so easily explained thereby) yet there is not any consideration of depravity so little insisted on, which renders the ordinary solutions of it so miserable and wretched. This great argument of its utility which unravils the whole mystery of our existence from its beginning throughout all eternity, is seldom if ever mentioned; it seemed too remote and far fetched a supposition to lay any great stress upon it, that what must be considered in itself as the utmost

most bane should be made conducive to the greatest blessing of our Being.

Hitherto have I considered the expediency of this corrupt estate to those only who partake of it; but this is not all, there is a further use in it which the learned have indeed been willing to presume but despaired of being able to demonstrate. "If we suppose one, says "Mr. Abernethy, in a superior condition "of being, having an understanding vastly "more enlarged than the human, and a "more extensive view of the universal "system, which comprehends many orders of created intelligences with various degrees of perfection and enjoyment, can we pretend to affirm that it "would appear to that mind incongruous in nature, that there should be such a "species of rational creatures as mankind, "with all the appointed weakness and imperfection of their present state; or even "that it would not appear a very proper "part of the Divine plan, necessary to the

“ the beauty and harmony of the whole,
 “ variously related to the rest, and form-
 “ ing a scene wherein the perfections of the
 “ Deity are admirably displayed, and where
 “ good is the true character of the whole
 “ scheme?” [Vol. 2, Ser. 3, page 128.]

I have said enough of the exigency of supposing the present state of imperfection an effect of man's transgression, not of God's own appointment in the beginning; with this difference I proceed to prove what Mr. A. presumes in every particular, except that of our own insufficiency to perceive it. I am only surprised that the relation mentioned, while it is so fully imagined, should be so little seen; or that the advantage of our corrupt condition to other systems, as well as our own future being, should be deemed to require so superior an understanding to comprehend it, and proposed as a matter that may not appear incongruous to much higher beings, instead of being clearly evident to ourselves. It may serve

as a further specimen to shew how the profoundest mysteries are sometimes explicable by the plainest means. For next to the benefit which arises from our own experience of evil is that which may be derived from observation of another's woe; consequently the angels in Heaven themselves, whose office is to be continual guardians of mankind on earth, cannot fail of acquiring a very important lesson of the necessary sorrows of disobedience from the fall of our first parents. It must shew them that even where the most cordial measures were pursued, and there was nothing done but what was essential to the recovery of mankind, yet darkness of mental and depravity of moral faculties, with an innumerable train of natural evils, became thereupon inevitable; the degeneracy of their being with all its bitter wages and effects was a necessary consequence in the nature of things.

Nor

Nor is this the only advantage of Redemption to them, for when Satan shall have long been banished from the realms of happiness and razed out of the book of life, mankind will remain the everlasting memorials of his condemnation and judicial punishment. Had he been ordained his final fate immediately on his rebellion, this might have been a sufficient admonition and example for a season to all other orders at that time in being; while the event was recent in their conception, its purpose would have been fulfilled; but as no trace or foot-step thereof would have afterward remained in Heaven, its effect would have gradually faded and decayed even from the minds of celestial beings. As mankind would have been but very faintly influenced by a remote tradition of what was done before any of them had a being, in comparison with the awe they must receive from an event which they shall be all eye-witnesses of themselves; so would the angels have in great measure

lost the impressi^on of punishment that like a vision is to vanish out of sight, without leaving a relic or wreck behind it among the regions of the blessed. Its effect could not but in the course of innumerable ages have dwindled almost to nothing, but by this method of permitting others to be corrupted by the tempter and procuring eternal Redemption for them God has established at the same time so many monuments of his goodness, and the dreadful consequence of his vengeance, that shall endure as long as duration itself shall last. The destiny of disobedience will for ever be made recent by this, and when every curse shall cease from the sight and observation of the blessed, mankind will be memorials to angels of the necessary evil and extraordinary punishment of transgression; such noble admonitions of the effects of sin and judgement by the remains of mercy it will be always meet for God to give and the most godlike creatures to receive. St. Peter tells us
that

that the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow them are things that the angels desire to look into; these certainly are well worthy of their attention, and for ever will be the most beneficial lessons of instruction to them. Nor is it an inconsiderable addition to our dignity that under our Redeemer we shall be the means of preserving the highest of created beings in purity and perfection; Christ has not only honoured our condition with the Godhead, in that he chose not to assume the nature of angels but the seed of Abraham; he has also made us everlasting priests and monitors of obedience to the most exalted creatures, the light and oracles of Heaven to secure all intellectual beings from darkness and corruption. O Satan how hast thou been deceived! How egregiously been made the dupe of thy own artifice and subtlety! With what wisdom has God improved a finite partial evil into everlasting, universal good; converted that which was designed by thee for the ruin of mankind

mankind not only to the eternal salvation of them but all the host of Heaven, and thus made thee his peculiar instrument and chosen vessel for the advancement of his utmost glory!

This benefit of our Redemption to the angels is not a matter that is founded upon conjecture merely, there are many passages in Scripture that afford sufficient grounds for the conclusion, tho' I do not find it any where particularly explained. St. Paul represents it in the epistle to the Ephesians, i. 10, as the design of God to gather together in one all things that are in Christ, both which are in Heaven and which are in earth. In the epistle to the Hebrews, xii. 22, he describes the heavenly Jerusalem as consisting of an innumerable company of angels, as well as of the spirits of just men made perfect; and in the epistle to the Philippians, (chap. ii. verses 8, 9, 10, 11,) he says that in consequence of Christ's becoming obedient to the death of the cross,

cross, God hath highly exalted him and given him a name that is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, of things in Heaven and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father.

It is very remarkable that as the Father is said in other places to have loved the Son and to have given him a flock from the human race, because he laid down his life for the sheep; so is Christ here advanced to a supremacy over angels on the same principle and foundation: in pursuance of his death he has dominion given him, as to his human nature, over them as well as men, and what should be the occasion of this, but that they all receive security and advantage from it?

In another place it is said, [Eph. iii. 15.] that the whole family in Heaven and earth, viz. the community of angels and mankind,
is

is named of Christ; for which there can be no other reason than that it universally derives establishment and confirmation from him; the benefit of the cross in a certain sense extends to all, and therefore is the Son, in the capacity of Redeemer as well as Creator, made Proprietor and Lord of all.

Since I made these reflections I have had the happiness to meet with an opinion of Bishop Sherlock to the same purpose, who says Vol. 1, Discourse 11, page 320; "That the Redemption and Salvation of men is the end of Christ's coming into the world is certain, and is revealed in the Gospel; but whoever shall say that God had no other purpose in view than this only, will judge hastily, and I doubt rashly. What relates to us immediately in this great dispensation, God has been pleased to reveal to us distinctly; but he has nowhere told us that we are the only persons concerned, that others probably are may be collected from

from many passages in Scripture. Our blessed Redeemer has all power given him in Heaven as well as in earth; principalities and powers, the invifible powers are made fubject to him; and they cannot be thought to be unconcerned in that work, for the fake of which their King was exalted and every knee made to bow to him."

He was far from a conception however of any natural proof of this, for afterward he adds, " That tho' the means " of our Redemption probably relate to " others and other purpofes, and are " upon the whole in every refpect fit " and proper; yet the propriety cannot " be difcerned by us till we come into " a clearer light and fee the whole " fcheme of Providence together."

Indeed I find that the relation of Redemption to the Angels has been frequently fuppofed from Scripture, as that of our 'prefent ftate to other fystems

has from nature, tho' this was esteemed no part of our Redemption; but the manner of each relation has equally been deemed a mystery beyond human investigation. Thus Archbishop Secker, after citing the passages above-mentioned, says, "Such hints as these of a scheme of Providence amazingly extensive were not given either to gratify or excite our curiosity, but to admonish us that in the religious administration of the universe there are particulars not designed to be comprehended by us at present, but by some other part of the creation." [Vol. 3, ser. 15, page 350.]

With all due deference to such great authority, however, I beg leave to hope that these hints may have been given us for some better purpose than to convince us of our ignorance, or admonish us that they were not designed to be comprehended by us; it seems much more probable that where Providence has been pleased to vouchsafe us intimations,
it

it did this in condescension to our capacity and to encourage us to search into them. There could otherwise have been no occasion for revealing them, and if the greatest displays of wisdom and goodness are much nobler ends, I think we may justly presume on these in the texts referred to, when they confirm such conclusions as the foregoing to us. I do not say that a Revelation is useless where a fair opportunity of explaining it does not immediately occur to us, but there is no reason why we should doubt our capacity where the design of it is obvious, or refuse to follow the light of our understanding wherever it appears to lead us. We should be very careful indeed not to advance further than we have proper grounds to go upon, never to extend our inference beyond our apprehension, or pretend to a discernment of what does not strike us; nothing can be more commendable than to confess our ignorance where we are not favoured with the light of knowledge, but it is too much

to assert that a thing was never designed to be comprehended by us in our present state, because we do not actually comprehend it; nor is there any¹⁷ excuse for blocking up enquiry into matters of Revelation (as has been done by Divines) by the little success that has been hitherto obtained in them, which has been occasioned not by incapacity but error and the want of freedom with regard to them. What would have become of all human science, had a desire of extending and improving knowledge been discouraged in other matters as it has in these? How very different has been the conduct of philosophers who have pushed their researches to the utmost bounds of nature, and been led by curiosity to explore the most distant regions of the universe, from whence so much glory has redounded to the Creator? But by a strange fatality the spirit of investigation that has been deemed so commendable in philosophers, continues to be condemned as the utmost impertinence among Divines; as being more curious than wise,
or

or wise above what is written, and favouring of nothing but self-sufficiency and conceit. Philosophers consider not any thing as too remote or great for their comprehension, but attempt an account of every thing that falls within the reach of their observation; they have recourse as regularly to conjecture as Divines to mystery where any difficulty occurs to them; the consequence of which is, that tho' the former sometimes over-shoot their mark, yet in reality they have made most wonderful discoveries. On the other hand, the latter by esteeming it presumption to infer any thing beyond what is particularly revealed to them, have been induced to overlook the most obvious conclusions; these are prohibited, as were final causes before the improvements of the last century by the philosophers, on the very same charge of rashness in attempting to pry into the Divine councils; non enim absque temeritate me puto posse investigare fines Dei, nec tantum nobis debemus arrogare ut ejus conciliorum participes esse possimus. Such were the maxims of
Des

Des Cartes, and such are the notions that continue to this day to cloud the consideration of religion; Divines are still incumbered with the prejudices of dark or half-enlightened ages, whence it is no wonder that so many things have passed among them for impenetrable mysteries which might have been explained with ease.

I hope I shall not give offence by what I am going to observe, but it seems to me there is the most room for improvement of science in Divinity where there is commonly esteemed the least, and for this very reason that men have almost universally supposed there is none at all for it. The notion of their incapacity with regard to matters of Revelation has been one great cause thereof, narrowness of mind has contributed to that of apprehension, and circumscribed our knowledge; otherwise the relation of our Redemption to the Angels could not have remained a mystery so superior to human comprehension. For it is only to suppose

suppose what was never doubted, viz. that they are ministring spirits to mankind on earth and will be fellow-citizens in Heaven; and if we make any use of our understanding afterward, the manifold use of our Redemption to them will be as apparent as that of the Sun to all the solar system; there is no more room for questioning it than there is the truth of any other final cause or philosophical conclusion.

But the passage that will appear most extraordinary and unaccountable without the principles of our solution is in the epistle to the Colossians, chap. i, verses 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, "For by him all things were created that are in Heaven and earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, dominions, principalities, or powers; all things were created by him and for him. And he is before all things, and by him all things consist; and he is the head of the body the church; who is the beginning, the first

first-born from the dead, that in all things he might have the pre-eminence. For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell, and having made peace by the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in Heaven."

The first observation I shall make is the strange anti-climax there appears in this according to the prevailing notions of mankind; viz. that the Creator of all things in Heaven and earth (not the meer instrument or agent, but great original and end by whom and for whom they were made) should become the head of the church, the first born from the dead, that he might have pre-eminence in all things. Does it seem possible for the Author of the universe to be, aggrandized by such means, or could his pre-eminence without them have in any respect been questioned? That Christ should in consequence of his becoming obedient to the death of the
cross

cross be highly exalted as to his human nature above all creatures in Heaven as well as earth & sufficiently extraordinary in itself, and cannot be accounted for without the supposition of their being concerned in the benefit of his sacrifice. But it is still more mysterious how he should be by the same means advanced as I may say above his own original divinity, or how this could have failed of its pre-eminence in all things without such apparently inferior prerogatives as his becoming head of the church and first-born from the dead. Nothing can be more unintelligible according to the common notions of mankind, and Free-thinkers not only pronounce it blasphemy to ascribe to Christ the highest honours of the Creator, but the most sanguine Trinitarians would esteem it madness to contend for any further dignity and glory of him. Bishop Sherlock is the only exception I have met with to this who indeed observes, " That according

VOL. II.

K

" person

" person had redeemed the world, or if
 " the world had been redeemed without
 " Christ, he would not have had pre-
 " eminence in all things, which yet he
 " had before sin came into the world;
 " consequently the sin of the world would
 " have been the diminution of the power
 " and headship of Christ. Upon these
 " principles of the Gospel Revelation we
 " may discern some prosperity in Christ's
 " coming to redeem the world; the work
 " was such that no person of less power
 " could undertake it; and his relation to
 " the world was such as made it fit and
 " proper to commit the work to him."
 [Vol. 1, Discourse 2, page 78.]

Tho' this conclusion is so very obvious
 from the text, yet so far as I can judge
 from the prevailing ideas of men, they
 have scarce been capable of conceiving
 it; so superior a work has the making
 of all things in Heaven and earth appear-
 ed to the Redemption of mankind, that
 they have had no thought of putting the
 latter

latter in any degree of competition with the former, or considering it as necessary to compleat and secure the original character of the Creator. Bishop Sherlock who appears to me to have had the best notion of the matter advances something towards explaining this in the same Discourse, page 78th, wherein he tell us ;
 “ That were we to consider one person as
 “ our Creator and another as our Redeem-
 “ er, it would be extremely to the dimi-
 “ nution of the honour and regard due
 “ to the Creator, in as much as the blessing
 “ of Redemption would greatly outweigh
 “ the benefit of creation ; and it would
 “ be natural to us to prefer the love that
 “ delivered us from the evils and miseries
 “ of the world to that which placed us in
 “ them. In the daily service of the church
 “ we praise God for creating and preserv-
 “ ing us, but above all for his inestimable
 “ love in the Redemption ; which is
 “ very consistent with the respect due to
 “ one great Benefactor, who both made
 “ us and redeemed us ; but had any other

“hand redeemed us, such expression of
 “gratitude would have reflected dishonour
 “on the Creator.”

This is a very just observation except in one particular which favours of the common error, viz. that it would be natural for us to prefer the love which delivered us from the evils and miseries of the world to that which placed us in them. For we should have been no more placed in this world without Redemption than without the fall, and we owe as much our present existence to the former as we do our final Restitution. With this difference I approve his Lordship's observation, that considering our Redemption as a deliverance from perdition, and the means of replacing us in our former state, we should naturally esteem the last benefactor most; and think ourselves less obliged to him who first conferred the gift of immortality, than to him who retrieved it after it was forfeited and lost.

But

But if this be granted, surely it may be asked without detracting any way from the merit of the observation, how infinitely does the obligation for our Redemption increase and multiply, when we consider it not only as a ransom from imminent destruction; but also as the means of preventing any future fall, and placing our happiness for ever after beyond reach of danger? What is a deliverance in any one single instance of obnoxiousness to judgement, if compared with a succeeding establishment in eternal safety; consequently how much more great and glorious a work must our Redemption be than our original creation, which never could be free from possibility of such disaster. When we consider too this last and greatest advantage of our deliverance as not peculiar to ourselves, but common to an innumerable company of much nobler beings, we are then enabled to perceive the passage in the perfection of its meaning; nor can we be at a loss to certify the reason why the same Being who
made

made all things in Heaven and earth (whether they be thrones, dominions, principalities or powers) should become the head of the church that he might have pre-eminence in all things. The church is a much more considerable body than is commonly imagined, and the work on which his headship of this is founded is the occasion of perfection to the whole intellectual system, consequently the most incommunicable branch of the original Creator's glory. Instead of apprehending blasphemy in the notion of this being any way surpassed, we easily perceive from hence how in all things it must have been defective without Redemption, and how incongruous it would have been (if possible) for any inferior person to fulfil the latter. For who should compleat the highest work which the Maker of the universe had begun and necessarily left imperfect, but himself? If any other could have done this, he must have eclipsed the Majesty of the First Cause of Being, and by establishing the creation for ever, have infinitely excelled the Author of
all

all things, who before had only laid a frail, precarious foundation of them that was ever liable to perish.

Here I cannot but observe an error of Bishop Sherlock, who, amidst many shining observations on this head, betrays a tincture of the common and contracted notion ; for he supposes that the intention of Christ's becoming head of the church was, that he might be head of the second as well as of the first creation ; of the elect people of God by virtue of having redeemed them, as well as of all other creatures by virtue of having made them." [Vol. 1. page 77.]

But Christ has not more to do with angels as Creator than with men, nor is he less the Author of eternal Salvation to the former than the latter, but equally related to both in each capacity of Maker and Redeemer. And this is still more evident from what follows of " its pleasing the Father

“ther that in him should all fulness dwell,
 “and having made peace by the blood of
 “the cross to reconcile all things to himself
 “by Christ, whether they be things in earth
 “or things in Heaven.” The fulness of the
 Godhead cannot any way be shewn so pro-
 perly as by the perfection of its works, of
 which enough has been said already; but
 what is most remarkable to our purpose is
 the making of peace and reconciliation of
 all things through the blood of the cross,
 &c. the direct agreement of which with our
 idea, cannot but be apparent at first view,
 and the impossibility of explaining it with-
 out this will be evident from the many mi-
 serable subterfuges that have been made
 upon the occasion.

For such has appeared the incongruity
 of the Father reconciling to himself by
 Christ the angels who have kept their first
 estate and never yet departed from him,
 that some have interpreted the passage of a
 reconciliation between these and mankind;
 alledging that while the latter continued in
 obedience,

obedience, the former were in friendship with them; that after the fall they became averſe, but that God being reconciled to men by the death of his Son, the angels alſo are become friends and miniſtring ſpirits to them, and that both orders conſtitute one church under Chriſt. [Burkitt on the paſſage.]

But nothing can be more contrary to the expreſs aſſertion of the text, which ſpeaks not of the Father's reconciling all things to one another or together, but to himſelf; of which others have been ſo ſenſible that they have hereby underſtood, not the bleſſed angels but the Patriarchs, Prophets, and all the faithful now in Heaven, or here on earth; viz. all things capable of a reconciliation, appointed to it, or that ſtood in need of it. [Burkitt ibidem.]

This is no leſs repugnant however to the text, which ſpeaks of the reconciliation of all things without exception to the Father, as plainly as it did before of their creation

by the Son; the conclusion of the passage is evidently a counterpart of the beginning, and the language in one case as universal as the other; to banish all possibility of a doubt concerning which, the words whether they be things on earth or things in Heaven seem purposely to be added. The meaning of which is, those that are farthest from all human imagination of being reconciled to the Father, even the blessed angels who having never yet offended are deemed incapable of being restored to favour, are all recommended to acceptance by the cross. For they were originally liable to fall as well as their equals in rank who did, the Supreme Being therefore could have no absolute complacency or satisfaction in them; the Redemption however will be the means of for ever securing their uprightness in future, and thus completely reconcile them to the Father, whose entire approbation they could never have received without it.

I could further shew if it were necessary, that the angels, instead of being excepted out of the things in Heaven are the only things implied, and that the Patriarchs, Prophets, and departed saints are not signified at all thereby. For in the first place they were reconciled on earth, and included in the things on it, among which they have been, and whereby is meant the whole course and succession of this lower world from the beginning to its end. In the next place they are not in Heaven, for, St. Paul after a large enumeration of them in the Epistle to the Hebrews (xi. 39, 40,) expressly tells us “that all these
 “having obtained a good report thro’ faith
 “received not the promise; God having
 “provided some better thing for us, that
 “they without us should not be made perfect.” The house not made with hands, eternal in the Heavens, is not yet provided, nor consequently can they be inhabitants of the City which they expected; they must wait till the resurrection before they receive the Kingdom ordained for
 VOL. II. L 2 them

them from the beginning, when all will be invested with the universal perfection of their nature, and triumph over death together. In the mean while it is sufficient that they rest from their labours in an inferior state of happiness, without ascending up into Heaven which our Saviour did not himself before his resurrection; this is infinitely above Paradise or any part of Hades, but I shall not insist on it at present, it being a sufficient merit of our interpretation that in every other respect it justifies the expression of the text, and saves the necessity of mutilating or maiming any part of it.

I cannot however leave it without some notice of that striking passage which is parallel to it in the first epistle to the Corinthians, chap. xv. ver. 24, &c. Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the Kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign till he hath put

put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death, for he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him; and when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.

That is; when the entire reconciliation of all things is fulfilled by their perfection beyond danger, then will Christ present this glorious Kingdom, of which himself as to his human nature is become a member, to God even the Father. The Son must reign till all enemies and impediments to its establishment are subdued, for the universe is totally his charge and undertaking, consequently must continue under him till its accomplishment and completion. It is plain that his dominion is only over his own works, this is all that could be committed to him by the Father; and when the necessary
imperfection

imperfection of these in the beginning with the inevitable consequences of sin and death shall be removed, then shall the Son deliver up his immediate government of the creation to the Father, after having made it every way an offering worthy of his acceptance and approbation.

Thus much of the greatness and extent of Redemption according to the Scripture, from the consideration of which I pass to an objection that has been made to the means of its accomplishment from nature ; which was occasioned by the same short-sighted views as the difficulty of explaining Revelation, and is indeed, according to these, the most formidable argument that was ever urged against the satisfaction of Christ from Reason.

For since the ideas of the creation have been so much enlarged, and such amazing prospects of worlds on worlds have been discovered by modern Philosophers in the
Heavens,

Heavens, it has appeared extravagant that a Being who is said to have made all things whatsoever, should become a sacrifice in behalf of so inconsiderable a spot as this inferior earth. It carries a disproportion of the same kind with that of the Ptolemaic system, which is so well proposed by Adam, in Paradise Lost, to the Archangel Raphael, that I cannot but exhibit it on this occasion to which it is so suitable; tho' the comparison between the common notion of nature and Redemption has in other particulars been so often urged. It will further serve to shew how the real systems have been both mistaken on the same footing, and injured in like manner by narrowness of apprehension, where they agree in wisdom and greatness of design.

When I behold this goodly frame, this
 world
 Of Heaven and earth consisting, and compute
 Their magnitudes, this earth a spot, a grain,
 An

An atom with the firmament compared
 And all her numbered stars, that seem to
 roll

Spaces incomprehensible (for such
 Their distance argues, and their swift return
 Diurnal) merely to officiate light
 Round this opacous earth, this punctual
 spot

One day and night, in all their vast survey
 Useless besides ; reasoning I oft admire
 How nature wise and frugal could commit
 Such disproportions, with superfluous hand
 So many nobler bodies to create
 Greater so manifold to this one use
 For ought appears, and on their orbs impose
 Such restless revolution day by day
 Repeated, while the sedentary earth
 That better might with far less compass
 move,

Served by more noble than herself, attains
 Her end without least motion, and receives
 As tribute, such a sumless journey brought
 Of incorporeal speed, her warmth and light;
 Speed to describe whose swiftness number
 fails.

The

The objection that has been made to our Redemption, while it is of the same kind with the foregoing, is infinitely superior to it in degree ; for if it appeared so irreconcilable with Reason that the universe should be only an apparatus or appendage to this earth, how much more does it that the Great Author of the whole world should make himself a meer sacrifice for mankind ? The disproportion of the object to its end is so much greater as the cause is superior to its effects, and the Maker of the Universe above all his works ; of which the celebrated Dr. Clarke was in some measure sensible when he said,

“ That the greatest difficulty in this matter to the judgment of right Reason
 “ seems to arise from the dignity of the person ; how it can be consistent to suppose God condescending to do so very
 “ great things for such mean and weak
 “ creatures as men are, who in all appearance seem to be but a very small, low,
 “ and inconsiderable part of the creation ;
 “ for as much as the whole earth itself is

“ but a little spot that bears no proportion
 “ at all to the universe ; and in all proba-
 “ bility of Reason the large and number-
 “ less orbs of Heaven cannot but be sup-
 “ posed to be filled with beings more ca-
 “ pable than we to shew forth the praise
 “ and glory of their Almighty Creator, and
 “ more worthy to be the objects of his
 “ care and love.” [Evidences of Natural
 and Revealed Religion.]

This is a candid confession, but how does
 he remove the difficulty, to which he says
 the answer is so easy ? Not by solving it,
 but by unsaying all that he had said, and
 arguing in a manner that he would have
 been ashamed of as a Philosopher. For he
 tells us, “ That let the universe be supposed
 “ as large, and the rational creatures with
 “ which it is furnished as many and excel-
 “ lent as any one can imagine ; yet man is
 “ plainly the chief, indeed only inhabitant
 “ for whose sake this our globe of earth
 “ was formed into a habitable world ; and
 “ this our earth is, as far as we have any
 “ means

“ means of judging, as considerable and
 “ worthy of the Divine care as most other
 “ parts of the system, and this our system
 “ as any other system is in the universe.”
 [Ibidem.]

But should we admit this earth to be as considerable as any other part of our own system, and the latter as any other system in the universe; yet however considerable the earth may be when compared with any other part of our own system singly, what is it in comparison with all the parts thereof when put together? And how infinitely does the proportion dwindle still, when it is compared with the immense bodies to be supposed in all the systems of the universe? The same thing Dr. Clarke says of the earth is applicable to an atom, viz. that it is equal to any other of its kind; and so it may be without bearing any proportion to the whole world, but it is easy after the manner he goes on to multiply it into equal importance with

the universe, and to make every other atom therein subservient to it. But how would Dr. C. have reprobated such reasoning as puerile in any other case himself, or what would he not have said of its folly had it been urged in favour of the false notion of the universe, as he has done it in behalf of the satisfaction; which on the contracted idea he entertained of its being ordained for the sole purpose of mankind, is liable to much greater objection than the other. He says indeed, " That the mercy and
 " goodness of God is equally extended
 " over all his works, and that the same
 " Divine Logos or Word or Wisdom of
 " the Father, which in various dispensations
 " according to the particular exigencies
 " of mankind has made various manifestations of God, and discoveries of his
 " will to us on earth; may also for any
 " thing we know have done the same
 " to other beings in other parts of the
 " universe according to their several capacities

“pacities and wants, in ways of which
 “we can know nothing and in which
 “we can have no concern.”

He had no more notion of their having any concern in our Redemption, than of our having any in what may have been done for them; such was his shortness of apprehension, otherwise he never could have been betrayed into such wretched reasoning as he was; which shews the great improvement of science with regard to nature and need of it with respect to Revelation, when a person who ranked among the most eminent Divines as well as Philosophers, was clouded with such narrow prejudice, and in compliance with it descended to such argument in behalf of the one, as he would have condemned for the most ridiculous in relation to the other. This is the consequence of not attending to hints given us by the Scriptures as if they were not ordained to gratify or excite our curiosity, but only to admonish us of particulars
 that

that were not designed to be comprehended by us; which has established perplexity and kept Divines in the same low state that Philosophers were in before the improvements of the last century. It may seem strange that the former should not only be so far behind the latter, but that the same persons should in one capacity be so very inferior to themselves in the other; yet thus it has been thro' the want of equal freedom of enquiry in both cases, which enables me to account for an observation of Mr. Jenyns, who says, " That whoever
 " will look back into the Theological
 " annals of this country will find that
 " during the last century the fashionable
 " Philosophers were for the most part
 " Athiests, who ascribed every thing to
 " chance, necessity or fate, exclusive of
 " all intelligence or design. These mighty
 " giants who fought against Heaven being
 " at length overthrown by the absurdity
 " of their own principles and the superior
 " abilities of their adversaries retreated
 " about

“ about the beginning of the present cen-
 “ tury to the more tenable sort of Deism ;
 “ but here again being frequently worsted,
 “ they at last took shelter under the covert
 “ way of Christianity, where they now
 “ make a stand and attack Revelation with
 “ less odium and with more success than
 “ from the open plains of professed Deism ;
 “ because many are ready to reject the
 “ whole substance of the Christian insti-
 “ tution who would be shocked at the
 “ thought of relinquishing the name.”
 [Disquisitions on several Subjects, p. 104.]

There cannot be a juster observation
 than this, nor can any one I think who
 reflects upon what has been said be at a
 loss to explain the reason of the circum-
 stances mentioned in it ; the truth is, that
 men have been more successful in their
 enquires into the mysteries of nature than
 Revelation ; both were once involved in
 the same ignorance and error, but the
 cloud of these has been effectually re-
 moved from the one, while it has con-
 tinued

tinued on the other; there can be no wonder therefore at the similitude of former or difference of present sentiments concerning them. Lord Bacon says, that small beginnings in philosophy lead men to infidelity, which further proficiency removes; this has been notoriously the case with regard to the creation and will I trust be equally verified of the Redemption, nor if we consider could it have been otherwise in reason with respect to either. For what could be more conducive to misguide men in relation to the first than a view of the magnitude and distance of the heavenly bodies, when they had no notion of their use and end, but stuck as to these in the mean conclusion gathered from their diminutive appearance to the senses? The supposition of their being all ordained for tapers only to this earth by night was tolerable, while they were imagined not to be far from it or much larger than they appear, but became insufferable when their remoteness and superior magnitude was known; men
however

however continued in it when the case was thus widely altered, and were sensible of its absurdity a long time before they saw its falshood. Hence it is not surprising that many, more bold than circumspect and wise, should vaunt themselves as Alphonfus did, or continue to do the like in a similar situation, and where the same disproportion still appears between means and their end ; which has unavoidably been the case since the vast discoveries that have been made in nature without any suitable improvements in Revelation, when there was as great or greater room and occasion for them. For the sacrifice of the great God (who made all these glorious worlds) for the sole salvation of mankind was not only more stupendous in itself than the formation of so many amazing bodies for the meer purpose of this earth, but also appeared of far less consequence to the one than the latter did to the other; the satisfaction did not even seem, as it was represented, of so much significancy or service to our Re-

VOL. II. N demption

demption as star-light to the earth; but was void of all apparent exigency in the nature of things, and had nothing to require it but an unjustifiable decree that could have no obligation in itself. Men had some faint glimmering to explain the use and advantage of the stars, but were in worse than utter darkness as to that of the satisfaction; since they were not only without one ray of reason to recommend it, but all the light thereof they had was totally against it, and the pretended occasion for it amounted to a reprobation of it. Hence it is easy to perceive not only why unbelievers have retreated from Atheism to Deism, but frequently sheltered themselves under the pretence of Christianity while they deny its doctrine, and are joined by many who are ready to reject the whole substance of the institution that would be shocked at the thought of relinquishing the name. All this is very natural and obvious to be explained from the ordinary course of things, for wherever ignorance and
error

error are to be met with, advantage will always be taken of them by the ill-designing, who will be joined by many that are well disposed on account of the difficulties that they labour under. All objections to the wisdom of the creation have been so perfectly removed that there was no possibility for infidels to continue upon this ground; the moral excellence and historical evidence of the gospel too have been so thoroughly established, that it has been commonly thought necessary to give up this post; but notwithstanding all other advantages of Revelation its doctrinal parts have still appeared so contrary to reason as to give great opportunity of opposition to bad men, and oblige many good men to betray its cause from their inability to set it in a proper light. However well inclined they might be toward the authority of Scripture, yet so insuperable were the difficulties attending its peculiar doctrines that they could find no resource but in deserting them; it has therefore been my

endeavour to place them on an equal footing with its historical evidence and moral precepts, which I conceived would be a considerable acquisition gained, and the only way in fact to restore them to their proper credit; tho' Mr. Jenyns says in the same Essay, "That if we believe the divine authority of Revelation any attempt to reconcile its doctrines is in the highest degree presumptuous, and to prove the reasonableness of Revelation is in fact to destroy it; because it implies information of something which Reason cannot discover, therefore must be different from the deductions of this, or it would be no Revelation."

While I am willing to do justice to every proper observation that comes in my way, I cannot but at the same time take opportunity to condemn all such notions as are injurious to the cause in hand, and appear to me the reasons of its not having hitherto succeeded better.

In

In this instance Mr. Jenyns is too much of a Divine as in some other respects he is of a Free-thinker, and his reflection seems not the effect of conviction as to the inutility of the thing proposed, but despair of being ever able to obtain satisfaction with regard to it; the remark proceeded not from a sense of the impropriety of Reason, if the doctrines of Revelation could be explained by it, but from an idea of their being beyond its reach, and was meant to set aside the value of an enjoyment which he thought that men must necessarily go without. There could be no other motive for condemning the use of Reason in such matters than this supposed impossibility of succeeding; for tho' there cannot be any greater assurance than that of divine authority, yet the proof of the Scripture having really come from God may be more or less; and our faith thereof not being founded on immediate intuition or mathematical deduction must certainly be liable to increase or diminution. Neither
of

of these evidences indeed admits of any further confirmation, but every other species of information does; and as to the proof of the Divine original of the Scriptures, this consists no less in the internal excellency of its moral precepts than the external evidence of their publication. Every wise advocate of christianity will join them both together, to which if the reasonableness of its peculiar doctrines could be added, the probability of its Divine original would unquestionably be augmented; this is the only thing that can be desired for the completion of its proof.

As to the notion that to prove the reasonableness of Revelation is in fact to destroy it, nothing can be more frivolous or without foundation; for in the first place, Revelation may be highly serviceable to fix what would otherwise be forever doubtful, as it actually was with regard to a future state; and in the next, it may make manifest many things which
we

we never could have had any notion of without positive information, that carry their own evidence after they are revealed (at last rightly understood) and appear highly agreeable in themselves to reason. Nor can any thing be more satisfactory than an account which thus authenticates itself, especially against all human expectation and when it had appeared for many ages big with the utmost contradiction through the false medium it was viewed in, instead of bearing any such internal evidence along with it. This no way destroys the Revelation, but bestows the highest confirmation it is capable of receiving, and may be compared to an extraordinary circumstance that is mentioned by Herodotus in his account of the Phenicians embarking on the Red Sea, doubling the southern promontory of Africa, and returning home by the pillars of Hercules. This extraordinary circumstance was an assertion of the Navigators that they saw the ecliptic or daily course of the sun lying toward the north

north, which was considered by the Historian himself who is charged with too much credulity in general as destructive of the credibility of their narration; but is now the only thing that could make us believe the possibility of so astonishing a voyage in times when navigation laboured under such manifold imperfection. It is an obvious conclusion that nothing but truth was capable of suggesting a phenomenon then so utterly inconceivable, and I am inclined to think that many things which have hitherto been deemed the greatest incumbrances on christianity will in like manner become the means of its future confirmation; it is not at all incredible that the Supreme Being may in his infinite wisdom have decreed that new light of this kind should arise for the further establishment of his Gospel, to ages remote and distant from its first publication. The miracles that were worked for the propogation of christianity, tho' attended with sufficient evidence to all succeeding generations, cannot be supposed

posed to have such forcible effect on these as on the race of men who saw them with their own eyes, or heard of them immediately from others. This defect however may in great measure be compensated by occasional discoveries of intrinsic wisdom that were not vouchsafed to the first Disciples of Christianity, who were above the advantage of them when their faith was established on such mighty evidences of the senses; and which were therefore much more proper to be reserved for future times, when these immediate impressions should have been long since removed, and the faith of his word become more liable to be called in question. That Providence should ordain such unexpected manifestations of his wisdom for the advantage of his people in remote ages, I say it is neither presumptuous nor improbable to imagine; it is something like the extraordinary light of the moon in polar latitudes when the sun is for the most part withdrawn from them, and seems peculiarly calculated for the

benefit of inquisitive and distant times; but it was what men had neither occasion nor inclination for in the beginning, when they were blessed with the original brightness of inspiration, and had otherwise such invincible assurance of the Divine authority of whatever was revealed to them. Mr. Jenyns himself observes,

“ That great would have been the merits
 “ of the reconcilers of Revelation with
 “ Reason had they begun at the right
 “ end; that is, had they endeavoured to
 “ exalt the human understanding to the
 “ comprehension of the sublime doctrines
 “ of the gospel, rather than reduce those
 “ doctrines to the low standard of human
 “ Reason, by expunging with inconsiderate
 “ rashness every divine declaration from
 “ the New Testament, which agrees not
 “ exactly with their own notions of truth
 “ and rectitude; which they have attempt-
 “ ed by absurd explanations or bold
 “ assertions that they are not there, in
 “ direct contradiction to the sense of
 “ language and the whole tenor of these
 “ writings;

“ writings; as some Philosophers have
 “ ventured in opposition to all men’s senses
 “ to deny the existence of matter, because
 “ they find in it properties which they
 “ cannot account for.”

This is a very noble observation, and it has been my utmost endeavour to fulfil the meritorious part of what is mentioned in it; particularly with regard to the great mystery of the satisfaction, by rescuing it in the first place from apparent contradiction and reconciling men to the possibility of its use; after which the proposed demonstration of its necessity to our Redemption upon principles of nature as well as Revelation must be allowed at least a well-meaning attempt toward a further manifestation of the doctrine. It is hereby advanced to its proper dignity and lustre as to its immediate use in relation to ourselves and appears no less than the Sun of our own Salvation, being visibly as essential as this great luminary in the Heavens to the

possibility of our present being. But what is still more for its advantage, and a much greater recommendation is, that it is equally conducive to our preservation in the next life, and was not only the means of rescuing us from a former fall, but will be of securing us from any future circumstance of the like kind, and placing us out of all succeeding danger. Here the glorious comparison that the great Apostle makes between Christ and the Heavens is in some measure applicable to his atonement; they shall perish but thou remainest: they all shall wax old as doth a garment, and as a vesture shall they be changed; but thou art the same and thy years shall not fail. Or if this apostrophe be deemed too bold for any other occasion than that of an address to the living God whom it was made to, we may at the least say of the satisfaction as the same Apostle did of charity, the great principle it proceeded from, that it never faileth; but when prophecies shall fail, and tongues shall cease, and all our
present

present knowledge vanish, this will be of everlasting service to mankind, and by its blessed effects be the perpetual means of preserving their future as it did their present being.

It certainly is a vast addition to its use that it is not only the temporal but Eternal Sun of our Salvation; but what compleats the whole is, that this vast and mighty luminary enlightens many higher and more numerous orders of existence, and is so far from being confined to us that the most perfect of all created beings are equally indebted to its benefits. Without subdividing the creation then or any part of it we may safely say, that let the universe be supposed as large and the rational creatures it is filled with as many and excellent as any one can imagine, it is no disparagement, but a mighty honour and advancement to the Christian doctrine. For the satisfaction bears an equal relation to them all, and is co-extensive with them in its effects;
being

being clearly comprehensive of the highest and lowest of moral beings, which may justly be supposed to include all intermediate classes. And before men had obtained such boundless views of nature from any human art or science, but were under the same ignorance with regard to other worlds and conditions of being as the inhabitants of the Canaries with respect to their fellow-creatures, who when they were discovered had no notion of any people besides themselves, or country beyond their own islands; the propagators of the gospel were enlightened to teach mankind that there are innumerable states and orders of existence beyond the capacity of human senses, all which communicate in the benefit of that amazing sacrifice which was made for them. However ignorant the Apostles were of the material, they certainly had this intelligence of the intellectual universe, which could be nothing less than inspiration, and we may safely trust the same inspiration when it teaches us that it is the

the Divine determination to gather all things that are together in Christ; men and angels will certainly be incorporated with each other, whereby the whole creation may be connected, and made equally to partake the benefit of our Redemption.

Nor can I conclude the present head without observing, that so far is this from falling short of the other, and consequently the character of Christ as Redeemer from being any way inferior to his dignity as Creator, that it is in many respects abundantly superior; not only as the creation was but the frail foundation and beginning of what the Redemption will be the completion, crown and consummation, but also as the first comparatively cost its Author nothing; for he spake the word and it was made, he commanded and it was created. The last however was not so easy to be fulfilled; nothing but the most extraordinary means of incarnation and death to the Son of God could properly

perly accomplish this ; and it is superfluous to observe how much the necessity of such an undertaking in view before the beginning of all things advances the principle of their formation above the most disinterested benevolence, which is the highest and most honourable motive that was ever yet assigned for them. It certainly exalts the design of the creation to consider, not only that its Author had no other motive than the happiness of his creatures, but also knew that he could not accomplish it without his own humiliation ; the determination of our blessed Saviour therefore to descend from his own Godhead in order to extend his image and confirm this purpose to his creatures, instead of any diminution to his dignity is the utmost advancement of it that can be conceived ; well might the Apostle say, it pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell ; great and wonderful are thy works Lord God Almighty, but still more glorious are thy ways O King of Saints !

I have

I have hitherto enlarged on the Redemption as to its extent and benevolence, I now proceed to a circumstance which may seem an exception to both these particulars; the wisdom and goodness of which however will be rendered as apparent as that of any other matter belonging to the subject. I mean the exclusion of the fallen Angels from all benefit of Redemption, which has appeared a mystery to many, and very few, if any, have been duly sensible of its necessity. “If God, says Archbishop Tillotson, had not had a peculiar pity and regard for the sons of men, he might have bestowed his affection and care upon a much nobler order of beings than we are, and so much the more miserable because they fell from a much higher step of happiness, I mean the lost Angels; but yet for reasons best known to his infinite wisdom, God passed by them and was pleased to consider us.”

In like manner Bishop Sherlock says,
 “ Angels sinned and men sinned, men only
 “ are redeemed. If God be just there
 “ must be a reason for this, tho’ not within
 “ our reach at present ; and when we come
 “ to know this, perhaps we shall be no long-
 “ er at a loss to know that the sacrifice of
 “ Christ was necessary to the Salvation of
 mankind.” [Vol. 1, Discourse 2, page 80.]

Had his Lordship said that when we
 come to know the reasons of the satisfac-
 tion we perhaps shall be no longer at
 a loss to shew why the fallen angels were
 excluded from its benefit, his conjecture
 would probably have approached much
 nearer to the truth. As to the justice of
 not redeeming them as well as men, I
 think this never could with any propriety
 be called in question ; both species had
 become obnoxious to judgement, and both
 might accordingly have been condemned ;
 the salvation of either was a matter of
 extraordinary grace, consequently of pure
 discretion with the Donor ; to which when
 we

we add not only the superior station of the Angels which constituted a suitable obligation on them, but also that their rebellion was the occasion of our fall, the fitness of the distinction cannot but be obvious, as the Redeemer chose to make it.

The first sort by their own suggestion fell
Self-tempted, self-depraved; man fall de-
ceived

By th' other first, man therefore shall find
grace

The other none.

MILTON.

Thus much is self-apparent, yet the wisdom, necessity and goodness of the whole proceeding may require some further illustration; especially as the satisfaction seems sufficient for the Redemption of both from judgement without danger to the law, and both might have been as well included in it, if there had not been some extraordinary objection in the nature of things. And this I conceive the meaning of Bishop Sherlock

when he says, that if God be just there must be a reason for the difference; i. e. his conduct is not founded upon principles of meer choice or indignation, nor would he whose mercy is over all his works have refused the benefit of his all-sufficient sacrifice even to the disobedient Angels, could it have been vouchsafed without detriment to the Creation.

This is now apparent from the very nature of the thing, for the design of our Redemption being to preserve memorials of all the motives against sin throughout eternity in Heaven, that of its extraordinary judgement as well as unavoidable evil became highly necessary to be established; consequently it was as expedient that sentence should be executed on the Angels as depravity permitted among mankind. For how could there be memorials of the Divine vengeance any more than the natural evil of disobedience without examples, and how could the motives against sin have been compleat without

without the great and terrible one of final condemnation in particular? This shews there was as much occasion for passing irrevocable sentence on the Angels as redeeming men, in order to the blessed effect of universal, everlasting righteousness; it was necessary to condemn the former absolutely to the fire, as well as snatch the other from the flames; for had judgement been omitted the end for which mercy was ordained would in great measure have been deficient, and if the condemnation of Angels could not have been duly immortalized in Heaven without the salvation of mankind, how could it without execution in itself? The great cornerstone and foundation of the whole would have been with-drawn, whereas by the performance of this and the care taken to perpetuate it every thing will be done toward the full establishment of the Creation.

B O O K II.

CHAPTER V.

DIFFICULTIES OF THE MORAL SYSTEM EXPLAINED AND OBIATED.

THUS far have we proceeded purely with a view to Revelation, the illustration of which has been the direct aim of our enquiries; yet it cannot but be obvious how many advantageous points are manifested in nature at the same time, especially the absolute necessity of sin and evil from the inevitable imperfection of all created being in the beginning, with their efficacy to remove this in the end and establish happiness beyond danger, whereby the wisdom and goodness of the moral system that they proceed from will be fully justified notwithstanding all the inconveniences that it now abounds with. The elucidation of these things concerns not Revelation in particular, but is a great desideratum of Natural Religion

Religion, and how far they are enlightened by what has been advanced beyond what was formerly apprehended it may seem almost superfluous to mention; but as this will appear still more conspicuous upon comparison, and on a recapitulation there is room to observe many things incidental to the main question for which there was not leisure in the direct pursuit of it, I shall expatiate further upon each of the foregoing considerations.

First then of the impossibility for infinite wisdom and power to make moral beings originally so compleat as without any restraint on freedom to prevent that sin and evil which are now so great incumbrances on nature. This may at first sight seem too much for human reason to determine, and it may be said what capacity shall presume to mark out the bounds of perfection, beyond which Omnipotence cannot pass in the creation, except Omniscience itself? Or how shall any thing be pronounced impracticable by all possible power and knowledge
but

but what involves at least a direct repugnancy and contradiction to our understanding?

It must be confessed the question is furrounded on all sides with difficulties, and it behoves us to proceed in it with particular circumspection; for while some have presumed abundantly too much upon Omnipotence, others have erred as egregiously on the other side and been induced to lay every arbitrary restraints upon the power of God in order to save his goodness. Many things have been declared contradictions for this pious purpose of which we have no clear conception in which case tho' the design was good, the consequence has been by no means agreeable to the intention. We certainly may compliment one attribute too largely at the expence of another; even the error of the Manichees professes a respect to the Divine goodness, and was meant to save the honour of one Supreme Cause, by setting up another to render

render that impossible by its opposition, which the former would have performed had it been able. Bayle proposes it as an advantage of their system, that it does not lay an imputation upon the good principle of having with full purpose produced a work that was to be so wicked and miserable; but only after having found by experience that he could not do better, or more effectually oppose the horrible designs of the evil principle. [See Bayle's Dictionary on the Article Manichees, remark O, and King's Origin of Evil, Chap. 2, Page 94, Note 15.]

This shews we may pursue necessity of things too far, at least in a wrong way, which many besides the Manichees have done, tho' not in so gross a manner; but however men have erred in this particular, I trust it is very possible by a right method of proceeding to represent the unavoidable-ness of evil in such a light as no more diminishes the Omnipotence than goodness of the Divine Being, but equally exalts and mag-

nifies them together. And in the first place it may be observed in general without any offence to the former attribute, that where the latter is so conspicuous and there is so much Reason to presume from its actual prevalence in the creation, that the Supreme Being would have done better, had the thing been possible in itself; here it may with probability be inferred from his not doing this, that (all things considered) it was not possible. I mean not to rest however upon this general presumption, but explain the impossibility to human capacity and comprehension; it would be folly to speak absolutely or say any thing a priori on the subject, but so far as we may conclude a posteriori from effects, from experience and observation of what passes among ourselves, and from accounts we have remaining of superior states and orders (which are the only means of judging in this particular) it will appear a moral impossibility at least that sin should never happen in the creation. This I am certain must be inferred if we
form

form our opinion of liberty from our own practice, after the manner of Free-thinkers; the difficulty will be in such case to justify the scheme of moral agency at all, from whence so much evil is unavoidable, instead of shewing the impossibility of preventing it without an absolute restraint on nature.

But I shall not place the cause of freedom on so disadvantageous a footing as the conduct of such frail, imperfect creatures as we are at present; I will suppose the utmost perfection of nature that can be ordained, in which case whether we judge from history or our own Reason, we shall find it equally improbable that it should never forfeit its allegiance or end. Men are apt to imagine that if Adam had not fallen before issue born, all his posterity would have been for ever out of danger; but what ground there could be for this supposition it is not easy to conceive, unless it was that his corruption

could not have reached them and they could not have been involved in the effect of his disobedience. They might have been however in their own, and certainly no such conclusion as that of their universal, everlasting innocence could be formed from what happened to him in particular, which is a sufficient proof of what must have been for ever liable to become the personal fate of others. Nothing can be more incongruous than to infer that what was incident to him so soon would not have befallen any of his species in the same station afterward throughout eternity ; but this is not all, mankind at such rate must not only have been far more perfect than their first parents in the beginning, but also than much higher beings, if any regard be due to the fall of angels ; and if we pay no attention to the account of this in itself, yet when we consider their nature, number, immortality and end, we shall find that nothing less can be concluded from the ordinary course and tendency of things.

As

As to their nature it was free, but not independant; of the most exalted kind, but subject to a vast variety of uses and purposes in the universe; in short the highest of all created beings were made ministring spirits, not meerly for their own pleasure but to act in subservience to their Great Author and his works, in which their happiness was ordained to consist; and the more exalted any creatures are in station, the larger is the sphere of their employment, trust and obligation.

In the next place when we reflect on the innumerable host of angels and the immortality that they were made for, how can it be imagined that not any of these, who were all ordained for an immense multitude of ends, a possibility of swerving from which is essential to their very nature, should ever actually be guilty of it in the course of infinite succession? It may seem peculiarly fatal that the only human pair which was made in the
beginning

beginning should fall so soon after it had a being, but how long the Angels had subsisted before there was any revolt in Heaven we have no grounds to determine; this we know however that their number is beyond our capacity of comprehension, as well as their being for a continuance without end; in which case that none of them should ever go astray is contrary to all reasonable expectation, without the particular interposition of Omnipotence which we have shewn repugnant to their very constitution. If the fall of some had not happened when it did, it is utterly improbable on the foregoing considerations that it never should; and when a thing was absolutely unavoidable at some time or other, it is of very little consequence in what particular period it came to pass; except in one respect, viz. that where it tended toward a consummation (as in the case before us) the sooner it ensued the better.

It

It is only from narrow, diminutive and superficial views then, from not considering the whole nature, extent, duration and design of the vast intellectual system that men are so prone to fall into this presumption on Omnipotence, as if it might have done better by making moral beings more secure from falling, if it would. The misfortune is that we judge of so immense a scheme by one incident alone, and even without duly entering into the consideration of this; because God might have easily prevented the extraordinary temptation and fall of Adam, whence so much imperfection has redounded to the whole human race, we are apt to lay the blame entirely on the non-performance of this, without reflecting how ineffectual the prevention would have been any more than how instrumental the permission of it will be to the final establishment of every individual among the blessed. When we consider further what appears of Angels, with their infinity in number as well as continuance with-
out

out end, which boundless view in each respect is the only proper medium to survey the matter thro', our amazement is quite changed: instead of being surpris'd that God did not make all moral agents so compleat that not any of so immense an host should ever fail from the beginning, we wonder how this event can possibly be secured in future, and all the blessed among men as well as Angels placed in eternal safety beyond danger, consistently with the inviolable freedom of their nature.

Here lies the matter of astonishment, which throws the difficulty entirely on the other side of the question, and tho' very few have properly considered this or entered into so enlarged a consideration of the subject, yet many have from the actual events of freedom, and the consequences which it is supposed will follow, been alarmed for the justifiableness of the scheme; which apprehension its advocates have rather promoted than removed

moved by contending for the lawfulness
 of its establishment whatever might be
 its final issue, or how many soever it
 was foreseen would involve themselves
 in everlasting misery by their abuse of
 it. " Every one (says a celebrated writer)
 " must have observed that most authors
 " on this subject treat of God's dispen-
 " sations toward men as if they were
 " speaking of one man's behaviour toward
 " another. They think it sufficient to
 " make the Almighty choose the most
 " prudent, likely means of bringing men
 " to happiness; and act upon the highest
 " probability, tho' (upon what account
 " soever it matters not) he fail of his
 " end. Now this may indeed be the best
 " manner of acting in finite, imperfect
 " beings and sufficient to acquit the good-
 " ness and justice of God, but 'tis very
 " far from satisfying his wisdom. To a
 " perfect Being who foresees the effects
 " of all possible means and causes, as the
 " same authors allow God to do, these
 " only appear eligible for the effects and
 Vol. II. R " ends

“ends which they will certainly produce;
 “nor is it any reason why I should
 “pursue a method which is apt and wont
 “to succeed in most cases, if I know
 “it will fail in this. To a person there-
 “fore that takes all the attributes of
 “God together, and considers the whole
 “scheme of Providence from end to end,
 “it will not appear a compleat and
 “satisfactory vindication of them to assert,
 “that God either makes men, or suffers
 “them to make themselves miserable for
 “rejecting that happiness which he at first
 “made them capable of, and endowed
 “them with such powers as rendered it
 “naturally possible and even easy to be
 “attained by them, tho’ this may indeed
 “clear his justice and lay the blame upon
 “ourselves; and yet these writers gene-
 “rally content themselves with going thus
 “far: they bring all our sin and misery
 “from the abuse of free-will (i. e. a pow-
 “er whereby men might possibly have
 “acted otherwise and prevented it) with-
 “out ever explaining the nature of this
 principle

“ principle, or shewing the worth and
 “ excellence of it, and proving that as
 “ far as we can apprehend, more good
 “ in general arises from the donation of
 “ such a self-moving power, together
 “ with all these foreseen abuses of it than
 “ could possibly have been produced
 “ without it.” [Law’s Preface to King’s
 Origin of Evil.]

This is a very just observation in the
 main, and I agree with it in every par-
 ticular, except that the conduct mentioned
 is sufficient to acquit the goodness of
 God, which I think it no more is than to
 satisfy his wisdom; to each of these he
 cannot but consider himself as equally
 accountable for the actual consequences
 of his creation, and if he knew that hap-
 piness would not prevail thereby, what-
 ever might be the occasion of the failure,
 every attribute except justice required
 him to abstain from it in the beginning.
 The plea that if God originally endow
 moral beings with sufficient abilities to

obtain their end and they do not, their ruin is from themselves and they are the only authors of their own misery, may serve to criminate the creatures, but not to exculpate the Creator; or if it absolve his justice, is by no means any recommendation of his wisdom, purity or Goodness. For what is the sufficiency of means, where they are certain not to produce their end? The more sufficient the more vain and badly bestowed upon them, thus are they contrary to his wisdom: as I before asserted how repugnant to this it would have been to make moral agents without enforcing [the end that they were made for, or obliging them to use those powers they were ordained for the right employment of, I now maintain it would have been still more repugnant to create them with a clear view that, however they might be qualified, they never would in general fulfil their duty; but all the means afforded them would only serve to involve them in everlasting misery. For this is worse

worse than conferring of such talents on them to no use or purpose, and casts as great a reflection on the holiness and goodness as on the wisdom of the Divine Being; the first of which should have been shocked at the sight of so much sin, and the second of the misery which would be its never-failing consequence. According to this the scheme of the creation must have not only been insignificant and vain, but also impure and evil; for the design that it was made with must be determined by the consequence which it was foreseen would follow, and so far as the latter is bad it is impossible for the former to be good; whatever blame may fall upon the creatures for thus wilfully involving themselves in ruin, it being still more unworthy of Supreme Perfection as wilfully to establish a system, that thro' their folly was big with the certainty of abounding evil. Their talents in this case seem only to have been given for snares, and to excuse the fate ordained for them; but it
is

is no wonder men have been driven to such arguments, if we reflect on the dark melancholy views of Free-agency and its consequences they have heretofore laboured under. For when we consider the fall of angels, which (as it was commonly supposed) included the third part of Heaven, and was followed by that of our first parents, which would have involved the whole human race in everlasting misery, and notwithstanding a Redemption will be the occasion of it to the greatest part of them; when we add these apprehensions all together, we cannot be astonished that the orthodox should lay the whole stress of their argument in defence of freedom on the competency of the means for happiness, without any regard to consequences; there was no apology to be made for it but by putting the latter out of the question, and endeavouring to throw the blame entirely on the creatures.

It was contrary to the scheme for the Divine Being to interpose for the prevention

vention of sin in any single instance tho' the whole system should be certain to go to ruin, and an innumerable race of creatures become exposed to eternal misery by the neglect of it; while the failures of freedom were in fact so capital and numerous as to leave no room for its justification or excuse for its establishment but in the miserable plea of the sufficiency of the means.

This is what has made the doctrine of Predestination so extremely horrid, tho' in its proper signification it implies not any thing like necessity or fate, but only such an original counsel and design in the formation of free-agents as is perfectly consistent with their nature and agreeable to all the consequences that have ensued from it, or will. These however have appeared so bad that it has been deemed blasphemy to impute any previous purpose of them to the Creator, and many have been ridiculous enough to maintain, that tho' God foreknew whatever would
happen

happen from the beginning, yet he pre-ordained not any way what he made the world with the most certain prospect of; as if he could have created it with a view to a different event from what he clearly understood would follow, or without actually intending and approving that upon the whole which he infallibly foresaw would come to pass by its means.

This was the folly of the Arminians from whose principle of fore-knowledge the Predestination of the Calvinists is a necessary deduction; of which the Socinians have been so sensible, that in order to avoid the absurdity they have plunged, if possible, into a greater. They say that God had no particular determination or design at all in the formation of free-agents, but that his plan from eternity was only general; viz, that such as believe and obey the Gospel should be saved, and such as live and die in sin be damned; without considering who would come within the predicament of
either,

either, or what would be the consequence to any persons whatever. [Burkit on the 17th Article.]

Tho' this doctrine is said to have originated from their denying all fore-knowledge of futurity with regard to freedom, yet I suspect that the fundamental cause of it was that the futurity supposed was too bad to be foreknown from the beginning. I shall not enter into the consistency of prescience with free-agency at present, it suffices to observe that the learned in general admit it, and that the Scripture never can be reconciled without it. Nor if this could be done, would natural religion endure the want of Divine fore-knowledge and determination, for what would be said of him who should assert that the material world was made without any particular design or end in it? Should we stile him less than an Atheist? And is it possible then to think that God who weighed every thing in the exactest balance, and so perfectly adjusted it

to the minutest purposes in the material world, should be so ignorant, unconcerned and careless as to the moral (for the service of which the other was entirely formed) as to establish it without any view or prospect of what would be the consequence? This is to become believers in part, but Atheists in the main; to assert wisdom as to the lowest branches of the creation, but reject in the highest and upon the whole; to maintain it with respect to subordinate instruments and means, but deny it as to the great purpose for which they were all ordained, by referring this entirely to blind chance, and saying there was no scheme or calculation whatsoever with regard to it. Certainly the more important any creatures are, the clearer should be the fore-knowledge of their end, and when a sparrow falls not to the ground without the permission of the Supreme, how incongruous to think that the final issue of the intellectual system should be hidden from his sight?

There

There is not any thing at least more proper than this, if possible to be known by him, the most honourable supposition certainly which we can form of the Sovereign Being is, that before he undertook a work of such infinite moment he thoroughly understood the end of it from the beginning, and saw the scheme was good upon the whole, whatever evil there might be to individuals from it. I therefore make no scruple to assert that predestination, rightly understood, is the perfection of Natural and Revealed Religion; it cannot be denied consistently, as an excellent writer on the doctrine says, without a denial of the Divine fore-knowledge likewise. And even then before any advantage is gained by this we must suppose, what appears to me impious in the highest degree to be supposed, viz. that if God had fore-known how things would come to pass he would have acted otherwise than he did. It is indeed the greatest reflection that can be cast upon the wisdom of the creation,

tho' the supposition of God's laying the foundation thereof in ignorance of what would be its ultimate event with respect to moral beings in all probability was meant to save his goodness. It proceeded from the same cause as the justification of freedom by the bare sufficiency of the means, and the real motive of it was that the Maker of all things might not be made chargeable with the bad consequences that are now apprehended; since if he knew not what they would be, he could have no direct design of them. But why do I compare the Socinian with so reputable and orthodox an error as the foregoing? It is even worse than that of the Manichees, which it likewise perfectly resembles in its original; being an attempt to excuse the Supreme Cause of Good for producing what is expected to abound with so much evil by pretending that he knew no better, as the other is by asserting that thro' the opposition of a contrary principle he could do no better. Each is equally intended to

to remove from the Source of Good the imputation of having produced a work that is to be so wicked and miserable with full purpose and design, thus far they are exactly similar; but the Manicheean doctrine is much more tolerable in one respect than the Socinian, since it implies that the Good Principle found by experience that he could not more effectually oppose the horrible designs of the evil one, who might otherwise have totally prevailed and made misery without any mixture. This, if true, was a very good reason for the composition said to have been entered into between them, but the Socinian hypothesis implies no such obligation for the great alloy of evil mentioned, since it leaves the good principle at liberty to act or not as he thought proper, and imputes the dire consequences supposed of freedom entirely to his ignorance or not knowing what he did; as if besides the absurdity of his acting in darkness as to the great event for which all things were ordained,

ordained, it were not also to the last degree dishonourable to play such a desperate hazard with the happiness of the whole intellectual system. For had the penalty ordained on disobedience been such that if the scheme had not fulfilled its end, it would have come to nothing, there might have been less exception to its being created for an experiment; but when the consequence of its failure is deemed the worst that can be imagined, this is an insuperable objection to its being set on foot without a perfect foresight of the success. The supposed fate of eternal torment which has been the chief cause of opposition to all predestination or design of what may come to pass, is the strongest argument for its expediency that can be urged; and the great numbers of every rank and order that have actually forfeited their salvation, make it still more necessary that the issue of the whole should have been understood from the beginning; lest all might possibly involve themselves
in

in ruin, and universal as well as everlasting misery be the fatal consequence. Mercy may be meant to individuals by the other supposition, but it is cruelty to the sum total of the system.

Wretched must the scheme of freedom have appeared indeed then, when some were for making the consequence of no moment or consideration, however bad it was foreseen that this would prove; others for contending, that tho' it was infallibly fore-known it was not meant or in any shape intended by setting the scheme in motion; while a third sort by way of improving on the matter still, were for putting all fore-knowledge as well as design and consequence out of the question, and for resolving the great event of the whole creation into chance; than which scarce any design according to the circumstances mentioned could have been worse. These manifold absurdities declare how variously mankind have been perplexed upon the subject, whence it is no wonder

wonder that some have gone so far as absolutely to deny the justifiableness of the institution; this was the occasion of that famous controversy between Le Clerc and Bayle, the former of whom has given us an abstract of it, which I shall present the reader with, as it affords a lively instance of the prevailing errors and defects upon the subject. “ Quod si quis hic objiciat,
 “ ut faciunt nonnulli, præstitisse nullam
 “ esse ejusmodi virtutem, quam exstitisse
 “ ei contraria vitia; unde tot horrenda
 “ scelera, tot calamitates, tantæque miseræ
 “ humano generi incubuere & tam graves
 “ pœnæ, etiam post vitam hancce, immi-
 “ nent; tum vero respondebimus, non
 “ tanti hæc mala Deo fuisse, ut propterea
 “ nullum specimen daret potentiæ suæ,
 “ in liberis creandis Naturis. Hoc nisi
 “ factum esset, posse fieri nulla credidisset
 “ Creatura. Imo ne Deus quidem ipse
 “ liber existimatus esset, nisi ipse eam de
 “ se opinionem omnipotentia sua animis
 “ hominum inseruisset, quam alioquin ex
 “ ejus operibus numquam concepissent.
 Neque

“ Neque coli potuisset, si omnia non boni-
 “ tate libera, sed fatali quadam necessitate
 “ & fecisse & facere creditus fuisset; nisi
 “ fatali quoque cultu, ac minime libero.
 “ Cum tanto malo, quantum est Dei
 “ ignoratio, & Virtutis extinctio, non
 “ possunt comparari vitia ac calamitates
 “ hujus, aut alterius vitæ; in quibus si
 “ quid præterea negotium nobis faceßat,
 “ reputemus oportet Deum esse optimum,
 “ justissimum, potentissimum, & sapientissi-
 “ mum, qui nonnisi convenienter virtuti-
 “ bus suis aget, viamque facile inveniet,
 “ & inibit; qua ea, quæ impedita nobis
 “ videntur, expediat, omnibusque intelli-
 “ gentibus Naturis nihil a se factum esse,
 “ quod fieri non debuerit ostendat. In-
 “ terim, dum ea dies exoriatur, qua omnes
 “ ignorantiae nostræ nebulæ discutientur;
 “ ea nobis dedit sui documenta, & virtu-
 “ rum suarum specimina, ob quæ ei pror-
 “ sus confidere, & quod fieri vult exspec-
 “ tare æquo animo possimus & debea-
 “ mus.”

This is a summary of the dispute by Mr. Le Clerc himself, given in his book *de eligenda sententia*, annexed to his edition of Grotius *de Veritate Religionis Christianæ*, Sec. 9, page 344; concerning which I cannot but observe with all due deference to the memory of so great and good a man, that he has exhibited a very poor, jejune and barren account of freedom; nor has he by any means confuted Bayle, as he says in his note upon this, so far as I can judge from the nature of an abstract. That virtue and piety cannot exist without liberty is obvious, but still these are only to be esteemed as means and not the end for which God ordained the universe; this can be no other than the happiness of his creatures, nor do I consider even virtue and piety as necessary to exist in competition with it. On the contrary, if they be not ultimately productive of more natural good than evil upon the whole, I think it would have been much
more

more for the honour of the Creator, had there never been ordained a possibility of their being.

Neither do I believe that God would have created moral agents meerly to make ostentation of his liberty and power, or that he might be worshipped by them; these are mean, ignoble purposes in comparison with the great views of the Creator, who was from eternity sufficient for the enjoyment of his own most perfect Being, and wanted not to display his greatness or be honoured by any creatures; but ordained his service purely for their advantage, and that he might make them partakers of his happiness.

Mr. Le Clerc says, "Cum tanto malo, quantum est Dei ignoratio, & virtutis extinctio, non possunt comparari vitia ac calamitates hujus aut alterius vitæ." But this can only be determined by the event, which the writers on this subject do not enter into as they should; they

almost entirely rest on the sufficiency or excellency of the means, without paying a suitable attention to the end; yea they commonly confound the former with the latter, sometimes set them up above, and sometimes in exclusion of it. Thus as many have contended for the justifiableness of free-agency from its competency for happiness whatever might be the consequence foreseen, there are others who make virtue of too much importance by representing it the supreme good of nature in itself, instead of the essential qualification for this. It is frequently urged that without evils equanimity would be extinct, and injury is the life of patience and forgiveness; were there no such object as distress there could be no room for compassion, and without adversity it is impossible that fortitude should be displayed. But without detracting any way from the merit of these admirable virtues, I cannot think they are so highly valuable in their own nature as to render the evils that give occasion to them, and on
account

account of which they are necessary desirable. So long as offences must subsist, long-suffering and forbearance are highly advantageous graces ; in like manner compassion toward distress (where this unavoidably abounds) is a most noble disposition, but still it would be difficult to convince men that it would not be better were there no occasion for it. The same may be said of fortitude and other moral excellencies which are founded upon evils, viz. that they are accommodations of the present life, highly necessary in our passage thro' it, but by no means essential blessings in themselves. The evils are not eligible for the virtues, but the virtues for the evils, of which they are the best but still imperfect remedies, and were it not for some further end it would be better to be without them both. To plead the advantage of distress by charity, of pain by patience, or adversity by fortitude which it contributes to produce, is to administer cold comfort to mankind, not to say insult and mock their feelings ;
it

it is an argument much more suitable to a stoic than a Christian and like the rant of Seneca who exclaims, “ Ecce spectaculum dignum, ad quod respiciat, intentus “ operi suo, Deus ! Ecce par Deo dignum, “ vir fortis cum malâ fortunâ compositus ! “ Non video, inquam, quid habeat in terris “ Jupiter pulchirus, si convertere animum “ velit, quàm ut spectet Catonem, jam “ partibus non semel fractis, nihilominus “ inter ruinas publicas erectum.” [Sen. de Divin. Prov.]

It may be observed however without any offence to piety that such an object is more worthy in itself than of its maker, is not to be more admired than lamented on its own account, and is much fitter to be redressed than looked upon by the Deity. But the strongest confirmation of my argument is, that, however beautiful the sight of it may be on earth there will be no such spectacle in Heaven, whence all such virtue as well as infelicity will be removed, which plainly proves that

that the former is not more essential on its own account than the latter. In short virtue should not be made the reward of evil, but happiness of virtue notwithstanding evil, and by the necessary means of it; this is the best way to recommend the first as well as reconcile the last, and whoever violate this rule, which they who apologize for evil very often do, are in every respect guilty of bad conduct; they neither advance the cause of virtue, nor remove the disgust of evil by such means.

While I thus freely animadvert however on the defects, extravagancies and errors of most authors on this subject, there is one very proper step pursued by them which in justice I must take notice of. They very reasonably maintain that there is more good than evil in the present world, even in the moral conduct of mankind which is most complained of; whence a presumption naturally arises that the event will still be better in the next. This is
laying

laying of a good foundation, to make happiness the prevailing character of the creation even as it is, and evil an exception only instead of a general rule as to the worst part of it ; nor can it be denied that, so far as concerns the affairs of this life, men act agreeably to their common interest in general, and are more serviceable than injurious in their generation to each other, tho' they sometimes deviate from this in an extraordinary manner. Thus much I say is evident of their fulfilling the immediate purposes of the present state ; but if we try them by the terms of evangelical obedience, which are much higher than these ordinary ends, and intended to advance men continually toward perfection ; if we consider the superior piety as well as purity that the Gospel indispensably requires in order to salvation, with the supposed consequence of not obtaining it, the prospect is quite altered. On these principles it seems the generality must fail, and prevailing misery be the final consequence, which has discouraged men from
looking

looking into the event, occasioned them to decri all consideration of it, and made them guilty of so many miserable subterfuges as have been mentioned to supersede it. This I am not at leisure fully to investigate at present, must therefore defer the discussion of it to another opportunity, when I hope to do compleat justice to the subject and demonstrate what Mr Le Clerc proposes only as matter of belief, viz.

“ Deum esse optimum, justissimum, potentissimum, & sapientissimum, qui non-
 “ nisi convenienter virtutibus suis aget,
 “ viamque facile inveniet, and inibit;
 “ qua ea, quæ impedita nobis videntur
 “ expediat, omnibusque intelligentibus Naturis nihil a se factum esse, quod fieri
 “ non debuerit, ostendat.”

In the mean while I proceed to shew how impossible it is to solve other things with regard to freedom, even such as have been esteemed least liable to objection, in conformity with the plan laid down. The great difficulty that has been apprehended

hended is how to reconcile its permission with the fate of the reprobate, but there is not less to render it consistent with the felicity of the blessed; since Mr. Le Clerc makes liberty the sole, immediate cause of all the evil that now prevails, on which principle the latter becomes a constant, necessary effect, that cannot be abolished so long as the former has a being. Mr. Le Clerc himself says, “Non
 “*tanti hæc mala Deo fuisse, ut propterea*
 “*nullum specimen daret potentiæ suæ,*
 “*in liberis creandis Naturis,*” as if the one could not exist in any case without the other, which supposition indeed is essential to his scheme; for if liberty be the only present cause of sin, while so fruitful a parent lasts, the offspring can never cease, and even Heaven itself is incapable of an exemption from it. The impossibility of preventing sin is sufficiently evident at this rate, but in such manner as excludes the possibility of its removal; which proves abundantly too much the other way, and implies that
 Heaven,

Heaven, instead of a remedy, can be only a repetition of all the confusion and disorder that are now so prevalent; as has been demonstrated at large on the exigency of a fundamental alteration of our nature in order to the extinction of them.

This observation I have the satisfaction to find confirmed in an extraordinary manner by an argument that was maintained by Bayle against the necessity of freedom to felicity and virtue, viz. that the good Angels and glorified saints are no less happy in themselves and perform not a less acceptable obedience to the Deity without it; why therefore might not we have been in the same situation with them? [See King's Origin of Evil, Law's Notes, page 355, note 66.]

It may seem strange that Bayle should thus take it for granted that the good Angels and glorified saints are without freedom, but it was no other than a just

and necessary conclusion from the foregoing account, according to which it can no more subsist without sin than our present nature; and as I was led to contend for the requisite extinction of the latter, Bayle was urged by the same consideration to infer that of the former in order to our final happiness; for if we judge of liberty by our present state, Heaven is equally inconsistent with the continuance of either. Bayle struck at the root of freedom from the description given of it, and it is strange that Le Clerc in such case should not have thought of any other circumstance to account for sin, which by its removal might have helped him to explain the exclusion of the effect without the ruin of his favourite cause. This the depravity or imperfection of our nature would have obviously contributed toward, but I suppose it was too unphilosophical a doctrine for him to make use of. Whatever was the occasion of this oversight however, hærebat in limne primo by overlooking so capital a consideration

ation, nor if he had overcome this first stumbling-block would it have availed him without many further steps; it would have only plunged him deeper into perplexity for a time, as it might have been urged that if the prevalence of present sin must not be resolved into the liberty so much as slavery and corruption of our nature, what account is to be given of the fall of our first parents from the most perfect freedom, almost as soon as they were made; and not only this, but of a numerous host of Angels from the highest rank and order of the creation? Here the difficulty, instead of being removed, appears to increase and multiply on the proposed ground of its removal, and Bayle seems to have had further reason for contending against the possibility of freedom to the blessed, and consequently its expediency to any original purpose of the creation; when besides the dreadful consequences of so many fundamental failures, it appeared at last inconsistent with the supreme happiness
of

of nature, and finally fit for nothing but the promotion of sin and evil. The seeming necessity of its eternal removal from the blessed would have strongly concurred with the actual consequence of its temporary existence to all other creatures to confirm men in the opinion of this.

When we pursue the subject thus far without proceeding further, or in whatever stage of it we stop within the present bounds, it remains incumbered with insuperable difficulties; the seeming light of Revelation is (if possible) more perplexing than that of nature, so that Le Clerc appears to have had sufficient cause for referring us to the last day for a more satisfactory solution of the matter, and Bayle some excuse for affirming it a repugnancy that never could be reconciled with the supposed attributes of the Deity upon any principles of reason.

It is no wonder indeed that the consistency between evil and infinite Perfection could

could not be manifested by the means of freedom, when there was a deficiency of so many other essential links to the completion of the chain. Or if I may be allowed another comparison upon the occasion, it was as if every intermediate step had been broken off from the bottom to the top of Jacob's ladder, so that there could be no possibility of ascending up from earth to Heaven by it; when men had so little notion of the depravity of nature, still less of the benefit that will be secured by it in the end, which could not be had without it in the beginning; with the extraordinary virtue of the fall of Angels as well as men (thro' the condemnation of the former and Redemption of the latter) to the establishment of liberty and happiness beyond danger.

Here I cannot but observe how many superior aids the Scripture lends to extricate us from the difficulties of nature, how utterly inexplicable the system of free-agency would be without the former,
and

and how necessary it is to put all the circumstances thereof together before it is possible to reap any benefit or advantage from its account; which at the same time shews the great need of a Revelation and a profound investigation of its doctrines. Men never err more egregiously than by trusting solely to their own reason in a matter that requires so much extraordinary information; and even after this, the further they proceed the more prone are they to fall till they arrive at the conclusion of the whole and look deeply into the remotest consequences of all the particulars related to them. Lord Bacon's observation is equally verified from Scripture as from nature, viz. that small progress in philosophy leads men to infidelity by involving them in difficulties and doubts, but due proficiency removes both the cause and effect of these by enabling them to see beyond the superficial appearances of things. For there is not one of the events alluded to but what bears a quite contrary aspect to its real tendency;

dency; not only the fall of angels and mankind, but the expedition with which the latter happened, and the depravity of the whole species by it; all of which are seemingly the most ominous, but in fact the most auspicious circumstances to the final triumph and success of the moral scheme that could have ever happened. Instead of regretting what has passed, or being alarmed thereby with apprehensions of what it is to come, we now are ready to say to ourselves, as our Saviour did to his disciples, O foolish and slow of heart to believe all that the Prophets have spoken? Ought not these things to have been? There is not a circumstance among them but what was necessary for Christ to enter into his glory, and his creatures into their eternal safety.

Nor can I conclude this head without again observing the advantage of the present method in shewing the absolute necessity of sin and evil without any offence to the infinite power and knowledge more

than to the purity and goodness of the Creator; which attributes appear not as heretofore to contradict, but mutually to strengthen and confirm each other. How egregiously former schemes have failed in this particular it is almost superfluous to mention; one having grossly trespassed against the universal power, another against the omniscience of the Deity to save his goodness, and represented the creation as to its main purpose a meer work of chance; while it described the impossibility of preventing sin and evil in such manner as to exclude the possibility of their removal, and thus compleatly overthrow the justifiableness of the moral system that was proposed to reconcile the existence of them. But it is the peculiar happiness of our plan that it places the inevitableness of these obnoxious circumstances at present in as strong a light as possible, and at the same time without any detriment to the future happiness of nature, or diminution to the infinite power and knowledge more than
to

to the goodness of the Creator; on the contrary it establishes and secures the ultimate event by means of all these attributes together. For instead of wondering that God with all his perfections could not or would not prevent sin in the beginning, our amazement is for a time at the certainty of his doing it at last, and the mystery appears transferred from sin and its effects to Heaven. But this perplexity is also banished by due reflection on his omniscience, which his goodness commonly engages men to diminish, or on the contrary seems to be diminished by. For when we consider how perfectly every thing that happened was fore-seen and in its consequences conducive to the end it seemed so repugnant to, all our alarms and fears for the final issue disappear and vanish. Besides the security that naturally arises from the further provision made for our well-being by the knowledge of sin and evil than ever was before, it affords us the utmost satisfaction to reflect that the Maker of all things was not

any way disappointed or deceived in the fall of angels and mankind, but that on the contrary the certainty of both these events was the direct corner-stone on which the universe was built, as appears by the designed Redemption of the latter from everlasting. This proves that every thing which was previous to the fall and led to it was perfectly foreseen, the Divine Being knew that his scheme neither would nor could be established without every circumstance that happened, accordingly the Lamb was slain in his own council and decree before any one step was taken; and since by the remedy provided it is plain that all past events were antecedently in view before him, what greater security can be received than the same infallible fore-knowledge with respect to those to come. We have as strong an argument for the future safety of the blessed from the nature and probability of things as our own finite understanding is capable of conceiving, but if it be deemed presumptuous in us to think of determining

determining on so vast an issue as the conduct of all free-agents throughout eternity, yet when the frail suggestion of our own reason is confirmed by the sanction of that wisdom which has never erred, here we need not doubt of the propriety of the conclusion or success of the event. This is neither a rash confidence in our own understanding nor blind reliance upon Omniscience, but the utmost assurance that the human mind can receive on a subject of such a nature; we have the satisfaction to see ourselves as far it is possible, and where our sight is unavoidably deficient, we are secured by that fore-knowledge which has never failed, but been most wonderfully confirmed by whatever has come to pass, tho' seemingly most inauspicious.

The Divine prescience then as to the manifold failures of free-agency in the beginning is demonstration of its security beyond danger in the end. As to the miseries that must finally attend the completion

pletion of the scheme, I shall only say concerning these at present, that when they are rightly estimated and compared with the vast design in view, they will appear no more than spots upon the sun; so that there will be no difficulty in supposing that the Divine Being pre-ordained and approved the whole, or necessity of concealing any particulars of it from his view, notwithstanding all its evils; his omniscience instead of an objection to his goodness will be the most certain proof and assurance of it. There is one thing to be required in order to the accomplishment of this and only one, I mean full freedom of discussion; let faith be endued with the fortitude and firmness of philosophy, which strictly pursues fact without any regard to consequences, or fear of Providence being hurt by them; let no doctrine be esteemed too sacred to be questioned, and it will in the end be found that religion can be no more injured than truth by investigation, but will equally be illustrated and confirmed
by

by it; this is a part however of the subject that must be reserved for future examination.

B O O K II.

CHAPTER VI.

REVIEW OF *KING'S* ORIGIN OF EVIL.

I Here proposed to finish my enquires on the solution of evil, but there has been another scheme set up for this purpose that is very famous, and greatly relied on by Free-thinkers of every denomination; not to say employed by some to undermine the foundations of natural as well as revealed religion. I therefore could not upon second thoughts decline the examination of it, and as it is entirely different from any other system
that

that has been yet proposed, it may afford some novelty on a subject that has already been so much discussed. Tho' it may not convey any further light than has been given, yet by its insufficiency it will serve as an abundant contrast to the truth; to shew the vanity of all human art and imagination without proper grounds of information; how men endeavour to succeed by pursuing their own fancy, and to avoid the necessity of Scripture while at the same time nothing will avail them but its use, and after travelling the most far-fetched rounds their only refuge is to come back again to the plain road of Revelation. In short every method has been tried (as in philosophy before experiment) but that which should have been pursued, viz. a strict adherence to the Scripture which should be as invariably attended to as nature. We have seen how many advantages the Socinians have foregone in science by relinquishing depravity and laying aside its peculiar doctrine, we shall now see what

what benefit others have obtained by setting up another account instead of it; the necessity of the former will be still more evident by their own confession and forced return to it after deviating from it in the most extraordinary manner. Such are the fruits of the scheme proposed by Archbishop King, who being sensible I suppose how insufficient the idea of liberty alone is to account for all our present evil had recourse to another hypothesis for its solution, viz. the essential inferiority of man in the creation, which is as follows.

He supposes that there is a regular scale or subordination of being from the highest of all creatures to the lowest; that as many of the former as the system of the universe would admit were actually created; that when their number was compleat there was a station left for others of an inferior nature to whom it was still a favour to give being, the benefits of life being greater than its burthens,

VOL. II.

Y

whence

whence it follows that there must be such creatures as mankind, who might have been in a lower class and ordained to a worse station.

“ Whatever system God had chosen,
 “ says the learned Commentator of the
 “ Archbishop, all creatures in it could
 “ not have been equally perfect, and
 “ there could have been but a certain,
 “ determinate number of the most per-
 “ fect, and it still would have been an
 “ instance of goodness to give them a be-
 “ ing as well as others ; therefore whatever
 “ system God had chosen, it would have
 “ come to what we see, perhaps it would
 “ have been worse.” [Origin of Evil,
 Note 23, Page 125.] This he exemplifies
 in note F. page 118, wherein he tells us,
 “ That if any one had a mind to fill a
 “ vessel with globes of various magnitudes,
 “ so that those of the second degree might
 “ have place in the interstices of the first,
 “ those of the third in the interstices of
 “ the second, &c; ’tis evident that when
 “ as

“as many of the first magnitude were
 “put in as the vessel could contain, yet
 “there would be room for those of the
 “second; neither could any wise man
 “ask, why the whole vessel was not fil-
 “led with greater globes, or why all of
 “them were not of the same magnitude.
 “This may afford an answer to those who
 “ask why God has not given a different
 “and more perfect nature to animals, viz.
 “there was no room in the mundane
 “system for beings of a more perfect
 “kind. But when as many creatures were
 “made of the superior order as the system
 “of the universe was able to contain,
 “nothing hindered but that there might
 “be others of a lower degree, as when
 “as many globes of greater magnitude
 “were put in as the vessel could hold,
 “there was still a space for others of less
 “dimension; and so on ad infinitum.”

In short I find that the scheme of the
 Archbishop and his Commentator is exactly

the same with that pursued by Mr. Pope
in his Essay on Man;

Of systems possible if 'tis confess
That Wisdom infinite must from the best,
Where all must full or not coherent be
And all that rises rise in due degree;
Then in the scale of reasoning life 'tis plain
There must be some where such a rank as
man;

And all the question, wrangle e'er so long,
Is only this, if God have placed him wrong?

That such an hypothesis should be
propagated by a poet, whose very element
is fiction; particularly by Mr. Pope to
whom it is said to have been commu-
nicated by Lord Bolingbroke for the
purpose of undermining the Christian
faith, and who is supposed not to have
been sensible of its design, is no way
extraordinary or surprising. Such an
original, as will appear, is much more
suitable to its nature, than that it should
proceed from two such eminent Divines
and

and reasoners as the Archbishop and his Commentator, neither of whom is chargeable with the bad intention of Lord Bolingbroke, or short-sightedness of Mr. Pope in matters of Philosophy and Religion.

Before I proceed to the particular confutation of this hypothesis, I must beg leave to produce a general reflection on it by Dr. Johnson, who observes, "that it is founded on the supposition
"that all subordination without which no
"created system can subsist, implies imperfection, all imperfection evil, all evil
"suffering, &c. But whether subordination imply imperfection may be disputed; the means respecting themselves
"may be as perfect as the end. The
"weed as a weed may be no less perfect
"than the oak as an oak. That imperfection implies evil and evil suffering
"is by no means evident. Imperfection
"may imply privative evil or the absence
"of some good; yet this privation produces

“duces no suffering but by the help of
 “knowledge. An infant at the breast is
 “an imperfect man, but there is no rea-
 “son for belief that he is unhappy by
 “his immaturity, unless some positive
 “pain be superadded.”

This is for the most part a just obser-
 vation, and strikes at the root of what
 the poet says in conformity with the
 present system:

Presumptuous man! the reason would'st thou find
 Why formed so weak, so little and so blind?
 First if thou canst the harder reason guess
 Why formed no weaker, blinder and no less?
 Ask of thy mother earth, why oaks were made
 Taller and stronger than the weeds they shade?
 Or ask of yonder argent fields above,
 Why Jove's Satellites are less than Jove?

The reason of the question why man
 was made so weak and blind, is not be-
 cause he is inferior to any other creature
 but to the end of his own being; to
 which, had been weaker and blinder than
 he

he is, he would have still been more inadequate, and consequently the matter would have been more surprising. The weed as Dr. Johnson says, is as perfect in its kind as the oak, and the same may be observed of the Satellites of Jupiter, which for any thing we see, are as well adapted to their end as the primary they move in subordination to; nor is there any thing remarkable in this but that it shakes the foundation of the present hypothesis, viz. that imperfection is the natural consequence of inferiority. If on the contrary however it should be found that the tall, strong oak is shorter and weaker for its purpose than the weed it shades, or that Jupiter is in this respect far inferior to its subservient moons, it would justly excite our wonder that the greater should not be made so perfect as the less, and be a still more striking objection to the doctrine now before us. Permit me to observe then that this is actually the case with regard to man and brute, the former of whom, as we have shewn

shewn falls greatly short of the latter as to the attainment of his end, and if in this life only he had hope, is commonly supposed subject to a more considerable share of evil; which indicates indeed that evil may increase with imperfection, but imperfection plainly does not with subordination.

This likewise shews the fallacy and folly of another observation of the poet in the true stile of this hypothesis :

What would this man? Now upward
 would he soar,
 And little less than angels would be more.
 Now looking downward just as griev'd
 appears
 To want the strength of bulls, the fur of
 bears.

But nothing can be a greater misrepresentation of the matter, the complaint with respect to man in all ages having been, not that he wants the superior excellencies

cellencies of an angel, or any inferior qualifications of the brute, but is not adapted as he should be to the particular exigencies of his own being. It was not that he required the endowments of a higher station, much less the bodily advantages of a lower, but a disposition and conduct more suitable to his own; which led the wisest persons to conclude the imperfection of the present state, and the necessity of a better in which this should be rectified hereafter.

Thus much by the way, but let us now proceed to a regular discussion of the hypothesis, and confine ourselves more particularly to the Archbishop and his commentator. First I observe then, as Dr. Johnson likewise does on the subject, that every reason which can be brought to prove that there are beings of every possible sort, will prove that there is the greatest number possible of every sort of beings. The doctrine very much resembles that which was heretofore main-

shewn falls greatly short of the latter as to the attainment of his end, and if in this life only he had hope, is commonly supposed subject to a more considerable share of evil; which indicates indeed that evil may increase with imperfection, but imperfection plainly does not with subordination.

This likewise shews the fallacy and folly of another observation of the poet in the true stile of this hypothesis :

What would this man? Now upward
 would he soar,
 And little less than angels would be more.
 Now looking downward just as griev'd
 appears
 To want the strength of bulls, the fur of
 bears.

But nothing can be a greater misrepresentation of the matter, the complaint with respect to man in all ages having been, not that he wants the superior excellencies

cellencies of an angel, or any inferior qualifications of the brute, but is not adapted as he should be to the particular exigencies of his own being. It was not that he required the endowments of a higher station, much less the bodily advantages of a lower, but a disposition and conduct more suitable to his own; which led the wisest persons to conclude the imperfection of the present state, and the necessity of a better in which this should be rectified hereafter.

Thus much by the way, but let us now proceed to a regular discussion of the hypothesis, and confine ourselves more particularly to the Archbishop and his commentator. First I observe then, as Dr. Johnson likewise does on the subject, that every reason which can be brought to prove that there are beings of every possible sort, will prove that there is the greatest number possible of every sort of beings. The doctrine very much resembles that which was heretofore main-

tained of matter, viz. that there cannot be any more or less of it in the universe than there is, and that there is no possibility of a vacuum or end to it. Thus the present equally tends to teach, not only that there cannot be any void in the system of intellectual nature, so far as it extends, but that it is also without bounds. For the same infinite goodness of God that, according to the expression of the Archbishop, may be conceived almost to have compelled him not to refuse or envy inferior orders the benefit of life, may in like manner be conceived to have multiplied the superior ad infinitum; for infinite goodness could never suffer infinite power to rest, while there was a possibility of a new object for it to work upon.

This the commentator seems to have been aware of, and determined to provide against at all events; for he tells us in the first place, "that it is of no consequence whether we suppose the
"system

“ system to be finite or infinite. If infi-
 “ nite, infinite numbers of the same kind
 “ will equally fill an infinite system, as
 “ a finite number will a finite one; for
 “ there is the same proportion. In this
 “ then as well as the former system there
 “ will be no room for more.” [Note G,
 page 124.]

He was sensible of the absurdity of the
 endless scheme however, tho’ resolved up-
 on any supposition to be secure; for he says
 in note 24, page 128, “ From the obser-
 “ vation that there is no manner of chasm
 “ or void, no link deficient in this great
 “ chain of beings and the reason of it, it
 “ will appear extremely probable also that
 “ every distinct order, every class or species
 “ of them, is as full as the nature of it
 “ would admit and God saw proper. There
 “ are perhaps as many in each class as could
 “ exist together without some inconveni-
 “ ence or uneasiness to each other. This is
 “ easily conceivable in mankind, and may
 “ be in superior beings, tho’ for want of
 an

“ an exact knowledge of their several na-
 “ tures and orders we cannot comprehend,
 “ the manner of it, or conceive how they
 “ affect one another; only this we are sure
 “ of, that neither the speices nor individuals
 “ can possibly be infinite ; and that nothing
 “ but an impossibility in the nature of the
 “ thing, or some greater inconvenience can
 “ restrain the exercise of the power of God
 “ or hinder him from producing still more
 “ and more beings capable of felicity. When
 “ we begin to enquire into the number of
 “ these and the degrees of their perfection,
 “ we soon loose ourselves, and can only
 “ refer all to the Divine wisdom and good-
 “ ness ; from our previous ideas of which
 “ attributes we have the highest reason
 “ to conclude that every thing is as perfect
 “ as possible in its own kind, and that
 “ every system is in itself full and
 “ compleat.”

Let us then descend from an infinite
 to a finite system, within which I fancy
 we shall find the impossibility of a va-

cum to be equally without foundation, notwithstanding what may be pretended from the vast number, variety and gradation of creatures in the world. For as to the declaration that every species of them is as full as the nature of it would admit, and that there as many of each class as could exist together without some inconvenience to each other, particularly that this is easily conceivable of mankind; if we know any thing, as Dr. Johnson observes again, we know of a certainty that this cannot be true. For who that considers the vast tracts of uncultivated land will say, that not any part of the world could with convenience to mankind be more populous than it is? I allude not to rocks or sandy deserts which the Archbishop says were given to other animals and not to men for their habitation; but to the fairest and most fertile regions of the world by nature, such as are most commodious for every purpose of human life; many of which

which are almost destitute of inhabitants and very few if any of them peopled as they might be.

What is very extraordinary, the Archbishop himself declares in answer to another objection, "That not the hundredth part of mankind which might live upon the earth does yet inhabit it; vain therefore is the complaint about seas and deserts." [Chap. 4, page 172.]

Not vainer, I presume, than the doctrine that all must full or not coherent be, or that God has necessarily created as many of the most perfect, and so of the less perfect creatures, as the system of the universe and the convenience of each order would admit.

The Archbishop endeavours to reconcile this in another place by telling us, "That the desolation of the earth is occasioned by the fault of men, who by wars and discord make fruitful countries
" void

“ void of inhabitants to till them, and leave
 “ them to the possession of wild beasts
 “ and venomous insects; since then they
 “ neither cultivate these themselves, nor
 “ allow other persons to do it, what won-
 “ der if God for the reproach of men
 “ give them up to be inhabited by brutes,
 “ wild beasts and insects? Those parts
 “ which we have deserted belong by right
 “ to them, nor do they otherwise increase
 “ more than is proper.” [Chap. 4, sec. 7,
 page 183.]

I have no objection to the scheme of
 resolving evil into the fault of man, but
 this is no way consistent with the notion,
 that there are actually as many creatures
 in each class as could properly exist to-
 gether, and that every system is in itself
 full and compleat so as to admit no room
 for more; particularly that it is easily
 conceivable of mankind. It certainly is
 not very easy to be conceived how these
 different accounts may be reconciled with
 one another.

But

But what is still more remarkable, if possible, the Archbishop tells us in the preceding paragraph by way of accounting for the perniciousness of wild beasts, "That this might have had its origin from man himself; viz. rage might have been given to the lion and venom to the serpent for the punishment of mankind; and this ancient histories both sacred and profane declare. But since this question was first moved by those who either denied revealed religion or at least were ignorant of it, I would not call that in to our assistance, or make any other use of it than as a bare hypothesis."

I can have no objection to accounting for evil from the extraordinary fall more than the ordinary fault of man; in my opinion the misfortune is that the Archbishop made not more use of each, particularly the former, for an hypothesis than he did; it has at least as sufficient ground to rest upon as his own, and
would

would have answered a much better purpose in the end. He would have found it however more inconsistent with his favourite scheme of necessary fulness than the present state of nature, since if sacred history may be relied on, there was no more than one pair of mankind originally created. This is at least as certain as that the lion was free from rage, the serpent from venom in the beginning; therefore the human species was never full, but much farther from such perfection at first than even now; nor was the deficiency occasioned by the fault of man, which makes the matter worse, and contrary to the design of every scheme for the solution of evil, lays the blame of it immediately on the Creator for not doing what was necessary in the beginning. To which let me add that the race of man not only never was but never will be full before the final consummation, when the number of the elect will be accomplished; a matter indeed most devoutly to be wished

but not to be expected till the end of all things is arrived, consequently this scheme can have no place before.

If the impossibility of a vacuum be thus unfortunate with respect to men, there can be but little reliance on it with regard to other creatures, especially superior beings that come not within the sphere of our observation; but if we examine the revealed account of them, which is the only ground of information we have to go upon, we shall find that the hypothesis equally militates against this, as against what we know and experience of ourselves.

The Commentator says in the latter part of note F. page 120, "If any ask
 "why did not God make all of the same
 "perfection with the angels? We answer
 "that after as many angels had been
 "made as were convenient, there was
 "a place left for inferior animals; and
 "after as many animals of a more perfect

“fect nature were made as the system
 “required, there still was room for other
 “more imperfect ones, &c.—If you ask
 “why God does not immediately trans-
 “plant men to Heaven, since ’tis plain
 “they are capable of that happier state;
 “or why he detains them so long from
 “that happiness, and confines them on
 “the earth, as in a darksome prison,
 “where they are forced to struggle with
 “so many evils? I answer, because the
 “Heavens are already furnished with
 “inhabitants, and cannot with convenience
 “admit of new ones till some of the
 “present possessors depart into a better
 “state or make room some other way
 “for these to change their condition.”

Would any person have imagined after
 this that the learned commentator had
 any notion of the fall of angels, or meant
 to make any use and advantage of it?
 Strange as this may seem yet it is no
 less certain, for he says in note V. page
 400, to which he refers for further ex-

planation, that the fall of angels made
 room for men and adds, " This is so easy
 " a thought that I find many are of opinion
 " that man was created with design to fill
 " the place from whence the angels fell,
 " and that these are not sent to Hell till
 " there are men enough to fill their place
 " in Heaven." But whether they are sent
 to Hell or not is entirely foreign to the
 question, since it is clear they are cast
 out of Heaven; which strikes at the
 root of the account that the wise Framers
 of the world only detains men here
 till a place shall be ready to receive
 them there, as by the foregoing expulsion
 this must have long since been the case.
 Nor is there any more appositeness in
 the comparison of the Deity to a prudent
 gardener in the same note, " Who pre-
 " pares his plants in a nursery to be
 " removed into the field or garden as
 " soon as the trees that grow there are
 " converted to their proper use; or to
 " an indulgent father who educates his
 " children at school and does not admit
 " them

“ them to the management of his domestic
 “ affairs or public business till room is
 “ made for them by the removal of such
 “ as occupy their posts.” For whether
 the plants or children are immediately
 fit to be transferred to the place of their
 final destination, or most proper to be
 prepared by previous training for it, is
 another consideration. Thus much is
 evident however that there can be no
 necessity for delay in the present instance
 of mankind thro’ any want of room in
 Heaven, or removal of such as occupy
 their posts. There must be some better
 reason for it; for there is no foundation
 for the present, or for pretending that
 God could not have bestowed the favour
 mentioned on them sooner without de-
 triment to others, when there are con-
 fessedly more places of others vacant than
 they can fill.

The commentator adds, “ Is it not more
 “ reasonable, more worthy of God to re-
 “ ward men with the kingdom of Heaven
 for

“ for their obedience and the proof of
 “ their virtue in an inferior state, than out
 “ of meer good pleasure to bestow so great
 “ a favour on them, who had done nothing
 “ at all, had given no specimen of their
 “ good disposition” ?

I shall not enter into his reply to this, nor do I think that an answer can be good which pays a compliment to one part of Divine administration, at the expence and hazard of another. I hope I have done better by demonstrating that both these methods are highly honourable and worthy of the great Creator, and that nothing can more strongly tend to manifest his wisdom and goodness than his whole conduct with respect to angels and mankind. Probably it was necessary for God to prove and confirm the weakest by the severest discipline and strongest means, but I shall not now return to this ; my present purpose is to shew that the main ground and principle of the difference between the respective orders, viz. want
 of

of room for men among the superior classes is false, which I trust has been sufficiently demonstrated.

If the scheme proposed be thus inconsistent with the fall of angels much more is it with the fall and future restitution of mankind; here it militates with the whole system of Religion, for what stronger implication can be given that man is not in the state he should be, than that he is neither in that he was nor will be placed in? Nothing can be more contrary to the presumption that he is now in his proper sphere, and could not be in any other consistently with the due order of the universe?

If whatever is be right in itself at present, what occasion for a future state in order to any alteration or amendment? There must be something wrong in the course of things in order to require a remedy, especially so vast a one as an universal judgement and retribution

bution in another world; but nothing can be more unnecessary, if every thing be as it should be with regard to the whole at present, or as the Poet says,

Respecting man whatever wrong we call
May, must be right or relative to all

For if our imperfection be essential to a necessary scale of being from the highest of all creatures to the lowest, and our partial evil in this respect universal good, the consequence is that it never can be removed or altered without an injury to the creation; thus the doctrines of a judgement and retribution for all mankind, with a suitable dissolution and renovation of their own system, the two first of which imply that the course of human affairs must be greatly rectified, and the last that a thorough change of things is necessary to its accomplishment, are totally without foundation.

This

This world at least must be eternal according to every principle of the hypothesis, or the great chain of being utterly destroyed ; for if

—In the scale of reasoning life 'tis plain
There must be some where-such a rank as man ;

or as the Archbishop's commentator expresses it, whatever system God had chosen for the universe, it must have come to what we see, perhaps might have been worse ; if this be true, it follows that the present constitution can never cease, however we may be removed from it or recompensed in another ; which is a consequence so repugnant to the Scriptural account of the consummation, if not every other principle of a future state, that there is no doubt of the scheme being propagated by Bolingbroke for the direct purpose of undermining it.

Enough has been said to shew not only how contrary the scheme in question is to

all religion, but also how unphilosophical and false in fact : it may therefore be deemed superfluous to pay any more attention to it, especially to explain further how it militates with the fall ; and so indeed it would be were it not to prove the great impropriety of prevaricating with any part of Scripture ; how much better men would succeed by adhering strictly to it in every particular, and what incoherent, motley work they make by mixing it with their own invention. It is to set off the superior advantage of Revelation by the miserable contrast of every other scheme, that I pay so much attention to the present, not that I think it deserves any such particular notice in itself. This may be a lecture of some service to the present age, in which it is so fashionable even for those who do not reject the Divine authority of the Scripture, to pay very little regard to its peculiar doctrines ; but to prefer any broken cisterns of human art or imagination to this inestimable fountain of living waters, that can alone supply their wants ; of which the
great

great use that has been made of the present hypothesis for the solution of evil by Free-thinkers of all denominations is a striking and notorious instance.

To proceed then with its opposition to the fall, this it is still more repugnant to, if possible, than to any other of the foregoing suppositions.

The general order, since the whole began,
Is kept in nature and is kept in man

is more flatly contradictory to the notion of his descending from a better state; and where there has been so fundamental an alteration it appears, that if he is now in the condition he should be according to the scheme of universal being, he was not at first; if he were at first, is not at present; for it is difficult to conceive, how two such different positions should both be the proper stations of the same creature in the necessary scale; and nothing can be more inconsistent than to resolve our present evil

into the original imperfection of our nature from its essential inferiority to that of other orders, when it was in the beginning so much superior to what it is.

It must be confessed however, that there is some provision made for this difficulty in the scheme, for it professes that tho' God made all conditions full in the beginning, and cannot arbitrarily degrade any from its class to make room for another ; yet any set of beings may degrade themselves and by thus forfeiting their place leave an opening for others to ascend into their state, whereby the universal order is preserved, and the wisdom of God more completely manifested than if all things were fixed to their first estate, and absolutely confined to it by necessity and fate. The superiors are taught to stand in awe, lest they fall from their height by an abuse of their condition, and the inferiors have the utmost incitement given them to choose the best and make the most beneficial use of the freedom conferred upon them. [Preface, pages 18 and 19.] This

This he frequently illustrates, as we have seen, by the example of the fallen angels; but here again it may be asked, if men were made to supply the place of these, what creatures were ordained to fill that of fallen men? This we are not told, and I fear we shall be at a loss to find them; since men unquestionably inhabit the same world that was at first designed for them, however altered, and the state of Paradise is now destroyed, so that if there ever were such a regular series or gradation of being without chasm or interruption, it cannot but be at present manifoldly dismembered; there must be many voids and broken links in the universal system that it would be extremely arduous, if not impossible, to find means to fill up or put together. For there is not only a vast vacuum in Heaven by the expulsion of the fallen angels without any suitable supply of other creatures yet to fill their station, but the next estate to this is utterly abolished and there is not any such order

order of beings to be found as men in their original condition; nor will there be I presume before the restoration, when the number of the elect will be accomplished, and the world will be renewed in righteousness. [2d. St. Peter, chap. 3; ver. 13.]

And if among the several orders of intellectual beings each is to rise in due degree as it becomes meet by merit, and room is made for it by the fall of any from a superior station, the re-establishment of man in his primeval state seems by the way more probable than an immediate advancement of him to angelic dignity; let Paradise be regained, and what has been lost recovered, before he thinks of aspiring to any further height; the rank that the greatest archangels fell from seems too rapid an exaltation for him at one step from his present humiliation. But of this more hereafter, in the mean while I repeat, that if there ever were such a system as the scale of
being

being it is at present manifoldly disjointed and cannot be applied to account for evil by its existence, but only by its ruin. This indeed it does compleatly according to what the poet says; viz.

That—in the full Creation leave a void,
And one step broken the great scale's destroyed;
From nature's chain whatever link you strike,
Tenth or ten thousandth breaks the chain alike.

Or as he represents it in another place;

And if each system in gradation roll
Alike essential to the amazing whole;
The least confusion but in one, not all
That system only, but the whole must fall.

According to this, if we believe what the Scripture says of men and angels, nature can be nothing less than an universal wreck: and instead of whatever is right, there cannot be any thing but what is wrong in it at present.

But

But to leave the poet and return to the Archbishop, who seems in some measure sensible of the difficulty he was laid under by the fall, and in order to get rid of it makes use of two very extraordinary methods when put together; viz. to diminish the change occasioned by the fall and at the same time advance Paradise above the natural estate of man. His words are, "I confess that according to
 "this hypothesis natural evils proceed
 "from the original condition of things,
 "and are not permitted by God but in
 "order to prevent greater; which some
 "perhaps may think contrary to sacred
 "history and the law of Moses. For they
 "will have it that the abuse of Free-will
 "is the cause of all natural evils, &c.
 "but this is asserted without proof. For
 "the Scripture no way teaches that there
 "would have been no manner of natural evil if man had not sinned; and
 "if it be carefully examined, it will appear that some kinds of natural evil
 "are attributed to the sin of the first
 "man

"man, but others not. Of the former
 "kind are first, the mortality of man who
 "would otherwise have been immortal
 "by *Grace*." After this he enumerates
 the several changes that are mentioned
 in the Mosaic History and not necessary
 to be here repeated, except banishment out
 of Paradise, "which (it seems) is an ex-
 "pulsion out of that state of grace in
 "which the favour of God had placed
 "man *above what was due to his nature*.
 "These and some others, he says, are ex-
 "pressly enumerated as punishments of
 "the fall; but besides them there are
 "many consequent upon the necessity of
 "matter, concerning which the Scripture
 "has nothing to induce us to suppose
 "that they arose from sin." [Chap. 4,
 sec. 9, page 198.]

I shall not stay to inquire whether man
 in innocence were free from all manner
 of natural evil, or not; which way
 soever this may be determined, it is plain
 there is a very considerable difference be-

tween Paradise and his present situation ; if there were no other than that of immortality, this would be sufficient to make the former abundantly superior to the latter ; of which the Archbishop himself seems to have been duly sensible by representing it a state of Grace in which the favour of God had placed man above what was due to his nature. But how could this be done according to the scheme laid down, unless we suppose that the Supreme Being placed him wrong? For we are not only told thereby that there must be such a rank as man or condition as the present state, but “ that every superior
 “ class is full, and that inferior creatures
 “ could not have a more convenient place
 “ than is now allotted them without detri-
 “ ment to others who possess that station.”
 [Abstract in the Preface, sec. 13, page 18.]

Whoever considers this, which is the vital substance of the whole scheme, must be sensible that man could not with any consistency have been placed by Grace in a state
 superior

superior to that of nature; it would have been nothing less than a breach of the universal system, and violation of the whole order of the creation. It is no wonder then that he fell from a condition so much above him, which circumstance it seems placed him right, and confirms the supposition I before maintained that in this case he must have been placed wrong at first; for by every principle of this hypothesis both situations cannot be his proper station in the same scale. Indeed, if I may be allowed to diversify the expression, the present scheme and the primeval state are like two opposite and unequal scales, which cannot possibly stand together, but one of them must necessarily prevail over the other.

Nor is the contrary attempt to diminish the fall, in order to bring down Paradise toward a level with our present state, any better method than that of advancing it above the proper condition of our being. It would be too large a question for me

to enter into at present, whether man were free from all natural evil before the fall or not; this is to be determined best by a collective view of the changes thereupon ordained, into some or other of which I conceive all the evil and imperfection we now labour under may be resolved, as will appear from the sequel when we proceed to consider at large the particulars above mentioned. Tho' by the way I cannot but observe, that there will be no more sorrow or pain than sin or death in Heaven; of which Paradise was at least the prototype, and as it bore such a resemblance to the other in the innocence and duration, most probably did the like in the felicity ordained for it.

But I shall now examine what the Archbishop says of some kinds of natural evil, being expressly attributed to the fall, but others not; and of there being many consequent on the necessity of matter, concerning which the Scripture has nothing to induce us to believe that they arose from sin.

For

For tho' he has not told us in this place what natural evils proceed from the necessity of matter, yet he has in another; and it is very remarkable that mortality is one of them, than which there is not any thing that is more expressly ascribed to the sin of Adam by the Scripture or himself, tho' he attempts to qualify it by saying that man would otherwise have been immortal by Grace. But as this objection is suggested by the commentator, I shall give it in his own words, with the answer that he returns to it, note H, page 131. "Not only generation
 "and corruption are natural evils, but
 "likewise pains of body and dissatisfaction
 "of mind, disappointments of appetite, and
 "death. Now it is manifest that all material beings are not subject to these, particularly man in Paradise, as to his body,
 "was material, and yet free from death,
 "&c. and the same is true of the blessed
 "in Heaven. Since therefore material
 "beings may be free from all natural evils,
 "it follows that they are not necessarily
 "subject

“ subject to such because they are material;
 “ consequently we must look for another
 “ origin of natural evils distinct from
 “ matter. The answer to this objection
 “ that seems to have so great force in it,
 “ (he says) is not difficult. 'Tis manifest
 “ from the book that when it affirms all
 “ material beings are liable to any natural
 “ evil, it is not meant that they are always
 “ actually affected by it, but that they
 “ are capable of being so affected at certain
 “ times, and in certain circumstances, and
 “ yet their circumstances perhaps may be
 “ so ordered that they shall be always free
 “ from it. For example, man in Paradise
 “ was naturally mortal, and tho' we do not
 “ know what sort of body he had, yet we
 “ are sure that he had an appetite to
 “ eat and drink, and needed these to
 “ support him. How then could he avoid
 “ pain, disappointments of appetite, and
 “ death? I answer by being placed in
 “ such circumstances that he should always
 “ have sufficient provision ready to satisfy
 “ his hunger and thirst, and such know-
 “ ledge

“ledge of all things that could hurt him
 “that he might easily avoid them. His
 “blood was inflammable then as well as
 “now, and consequently he was subject
 “to a fever. His limbs might be broken
 “and disjoined then as well as now, and
 “that must disable him to manage his
 “business, and disappoint a natural ap-
 “petite of moving where his occasion
 “required. But God gave him the
 “tree of life as a remedy against all natural
 “decays and distempers of body, and
 “either such a prospect of what could
 “hurt him as might enable him to avoid
 “the occasion, or else if it happened, he
 “was restored by the use of the same tree
 “of life.”

It is rather extraordinary at first sight
 that creatures should be always by nature
 liable to any evil, and yet have their
 circumstances so ordered as to be ever
 free from it; should be necessarily by
 constitution subject to it, but never in fact
 affected by it. This is a seeming paradox,
 yet

yet must be acknowledged possible, unless we mean to admit sin in Heaven or banish freedom from it; which proves the extraordinary means required to shew its consistency with the latter without danger of the former, tho' men have commonly had so little notion of any difficulty about the matter. To proceed therefore with the remainder, I ask, If man were to have been immortal, what is the difference, whether this would have been by ordinary or extraordinary, by internal or external means? It signifies nothing how the privilege would have been secured to him, since it is certain that it would have been his portion, had he not eaten of the forbidden fruit; whereas man has now no means whatever of securing himself from death. It is a meer evasion then to resolve our present corruption and dissolution into necessity of matter instead of sin, since it is plain that if man had not sinned in the manner above mentioned, the matter he is composed of would not have sustained any such effects, and it is a point of the utmost

utmost indifference how it would have been preserved from them. Man had no further concern or care than to persist in his obedience, which it was very possible for him to do; and if he had done this, immortality would have been as much the certain consequence thereof, as death is of his present state.

But what the commentator says at the conclusion of the foregoing note is still more surprising; "As to the blessed in Heaven, their case is much more easy to be accounted for, and I think those words of chap. 4, sec. 3, sub. 2, are sufficient. I answer these bodies are not therefore immortal because they are incorruptible (for that would be inconsistent with the nature of the matter they are composed of) but because they are put into such circumstances by the Deity, that they can even with pleasure foresee and prevent all such things as tend to introduce either corruption or pain. I am apt to think the objector either never

“read, or did not consider this when he
“made the objection.”

It is impossible to think that the learned commentator, when he made this reply, had never read, but it is very plain that at the time he did not consider the famous passage of St. Paul ; for this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal immortality ; when shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, death is swallowed up in victory. That flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of Heaven, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption is what the Apostle was very sensible of ; for it would indeed be the height of contradiction to suppose that materials of so frail and perishing a nature can possibly be adapted to an immortal system, while they continue as they are. He does not seem so sensible however that the matter we are composed of is altogether incapable of alteration, or being worked up to the perfection mentioned ; for he expressly tells us that we shall all be changed, and says particularly

particularly of the body, it is sown in corruption it is raised in incorruption ; it is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory ; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power ; it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. Still however it remains a body, which neither the Archbishop nor his commentator appears to question ; and whether it is made incorruptible by the providence of God, or by a power invested in ourselves for its preservation is totally immaterial. Whatever any thing is at present it is by the power of God, who certainly can do as much by his own care for the body as he can enable us to do for it ourselves ; and if there be any difference as to the manner how it will be made proof against corruption, the Apostle would never have expressed himself so fully as he has done of its assuming the contrary quality in its own nature.

This leads me to another observation of the Archbishop, viz. “ That a soul
 “ when united to a portion of ethereal, uni-
 “ form, and perfectly fluid matter, free
 Vol. II. D d 2 “ from

" from the impediment of gravity and re-
 " sistance may in all probability move its
 " body whithersoever it pleases. Such a
 " body therefore would be perfectly obse-
 " quious to the thought and will of the
 " soul that inhabits it ; and if it received
 " any detriment from the neighbouring
 " bodies, it could repair this by its will
 " alone ; at least as long as the ether con-
 " tinues in its fluidity and purity. Unless
 " the animal therefore willed the contrary,
 " its body would be incorruptible and
 " always fit for union, i. e. immortal."
 [Chap. 4, sec. 3, page 149.]

Whatever light this may convey to
 others, I confess I have no better notion
 how the most perfect fluid may be made
 incorruptible by our own care than a
 solid by that of Providence ; to me it seems
 much more proper to leave the Divine
 Being to the completion of his own work,
 in firm faith that what he has promised he
 both can and will perform, than thus to bind
 down Omnipotence and build ethereal
 castles

castles of our own conceits. Nothing can be more ridiculous than for us to prescribe laws how things, of which we have no notion, must be done; and wretched would be our security for immortality indeed, if we had no better than our own ability to explain how any kind of matter may be made incorruptible by our own care; this is much farther from our conception than how any other kind may be made so by the infinite wisdom and power of Providence; it is our felicity that God can think of a thousand ways to fulfil his ends which are utterly inconceivable to us, and in all probability make matter, however solid, as adamantine as he pleases. Let us not think of taking the preservation of his everlasting kingdom out of his Almighty hands, or imagine we shall ever be able to do better by having it in our own.

The Archbishop further says in opposition to the argument, That man was created at first immortal, therefore mortality

lity is not an inseparable attendant upon solid bodies; "I answer, it does not appear to us of what sort the bodies of mankind were before the fall, consequently nothing can be argued from thence against the necessary mortality of all terrestrial ones." [Chap. 4, sec. 3, sub. 4, page 151.]

To which I answer, that enough appears to us of the bodies of our first parents to know that they were of the earth, earthy, and made out of the dust, which is a sufficient argument at least that they were terrestrial, whether it be against the necessary mortality of all such or not.

The Archbishop adds in the same place,
 "Further we should remember that our
 "first parents were naturally mortal; but
 "that God covenanted with them for immortality as a matter of favour, and
 "upon particular conditions. Not that
 "they should have continued upon earth
 "for

“for ever, but that God promised to
 “translate them at a proper time by his
 “especial favour, and preserve them in
 “a place fit for the enjoyment of Eternity;
 “as we believe he did with Enoch and
 “Elias.”

This is in the first place begging of the question, or borrowing of the point asserted in it from the narrow and contracted notions of the present state; it is common to imagine that, because death is now unavoidable it must have been always natural to man; whereas if he had not sinned against the forbidden fruit, it would have been altogether as contrary to his nature as immortality at present; Divine Providence would have been as effectual a security against the one as our corruptible condition is an impediment to the other; whatever may be said of man's blood being inflammable in Paradise as well as now, or his limbs being liable to broken. God made not death,

death, says the book of Wisdom, but created all things that they might have their being, and the generations of men were healthful, and there was no poison of destruction in them, nor the kingdom of death upon earth, for righteousness is immortal; but ungodly men with their words and works called it to them.

Death is not an ordinary but extraordinary appendage of our being, an heterogeneous circumstance attending this, like sin whereby it was occasioned, and what would never have been otherwise by the establishment of the Creator. Neither was immortality a gift or favour more than existence, tho' it certainly was a much greater, nor did God covenant with man for the former upon any further conditions than for the latter; each was equally a matter of donation, and on the same occasion to be removed by the original law of the creation, however this has been misconstrued from the event. Life itself was to last no longer than
immortality

immortality, as immortality no longer than obedience; which shews that it was not more inseparably coupled with righteousness than our being. Therefore to make immortality an extraordinary and the present state the ordinary portion of it, is in every respect to violate the truth of things; when the former was thus essentially connected with our existence by the law that life was founded on, and the latter never would have been in any case whatever without the most extraordinary dispensation from it.

This is what I call a supernatural appointment, not that which was ordained in the beginning, and entailed on the nature of each individual so long as it should endure, but that which ensued when the fundamental law of life was broken, and was established in pursuance of an extraordinary deviation from it. The institution of this mortal state after the fall is in reality the eccentric circumstance of our being, instead of immorta-

lity before; therefore the consideration of our present as our only natural condition is founded on a most vulgar and preposterous prejudice; it is a mistake of the Divine Archetype and standard from what followed the depravity and corruption of our nature; a misapprehension of that for the only regular portion of our being which, with regard to our first and final state, is not only the most foreign, but most contrary and repugnant to it.

Nor is there any better foundation for the assertion that men should not have continued upon earth for ever, but that God promised to translate them at a proper time by his especial favour, and preserve them in a place fit for the enjoyment of eternity, like Enoch and Elias. I should be glad to know where this promise is to be found, or where it ever existed except in men's own imagination, of which I shall shortly shew the grounds. That it is not to be met with in the Scripture I am certain, which is the only proper foundation
to

to build such an assurance on; but on the contrary this informs us, that when God created the race, male and female, he blessed them, and said: Increase and multiply and replenish the earth, &c. Gen. i chap. 27 and 28 verses. There is not the least hint of a translation from it, or any thing promised beyond the state that they were placed in; which makes it surprizing at first view what pretence there could be for men to extend the grant as they have done, a circumstance that has been almost an universal error. But this on further consideration is easy to be accounted for from the narrow notions above mentioned; and in the first place as men have been apt to infer that because death is now unavoidable it must have been always natural, so from the present establishment of this world as a seminary for another (with its inherent imperfection in itself) have they been led to suppose it must have been always subservient to the same purpose, and incapable of any better. This is what the Archbishop seems to have been possessed of, when he said, that

God promised to translate men at a proper time by his especial favour, and preserve them in a place fit for the enjoyment of eternity. The impossibility of this world being proper for the end proposed appeared so strong, that tho' death was not expedient, it was thought there must be a translation from it.

But what contributed perhaps as much as any thing to this supposed necessity of a removal was the notion, that if mankind had remained immortal they must have multiplied beyond possibility of support in this world; when they were ordained to increase continually without diminution, which could not but have made the earth in process of time incapable of affording room for them.

Such were evidently the grounds of this pretended promise of a translation, to the maintainers of which I say, as our Saviour did to the Sadducees, Ye err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God. The same ignorance and false notion

notion of another life from what is peculiar to the present serves to misguide you; for in the first place, God could make man for eternity, with the same ease as for a day, so could he as well qualify this world for the enjoyment of immortality as any other. 'Tis true, it now can serve only for a nursery, this is the sole use that can be at present made of it. But why? Because sin has invaded it, which obliged the Creator to reduce his workmanship by a great variety of alteration to the low state that it is in, so as to be fit for a short-lived habitation only. But this imperfection is by no means essential to the world itself, on the contrary St. Peter teaches us that God will dissolve the present frame of things, and form its ingredients from a new one in which dwelleth righteousness, 2d Eph. chap. 3, ver. 13; the want of this (which will be supplied) being the only circumstance that renders the earth incapable of being made an Heaven. Such will be this world hereafter and such was it in the beginning, very different from

from what it was in the days of Enoch and Elias, when it was utterly unfit for an everlasting habitation, and an exemption from death would have been the greatest hardship without a translation from it.

As to the last grounds of the doctrine, viz. the supposed necessity of perpetual increase without diminution, this is equally frivolous with the foregoing, and very similar to the objection of the Sadducees concerning the property of husbands and wives at the resurrection. For as our Saviour says, there will be no more marrying or giving in marriage, increase for which it was designed will be at an end when the number of the elect is once accomplished; and this would have equally been the case in Paradise, after the earth had become replenished. The consummation is nothing more or less than the completion of what would have been, if possible, without the fall; and is therefore a certain specimen of what would have ensued in process of time, if

if this had never happened. •The propagation of mankind would have been abolished when the precise end for which it was ordained had become fulfilled ; nothing can be more absurd than to imagine that it would have proceeded ad infinitum, whereby not only the earth but universe (if it have any end or bounds) must have at length become insufficient for them. The Scripture much more properly confines the number of the species to the world that they were made for, and when there are saints enough to fill this in its proper state, there will be no more propagation or translation, but we shall all be changed ; our removal is peculiar to our present situation, that never would have been without the fall and never will be after the restitution.

The Archbishop adds, in the same section, “ That as soon as the covenant with
 “ God was broken by sin, man was restored
 “ to his native mortality, and subjected to
 “ those inconveniences to which the order
 of

“ of nature and the chain of natural causes
 “ rendered such bodies as those of man-
 “ kind obnoxious. For tho’ God has not
 “ so far tied himself up to the laws of
 “ nature but that he may in many cases
 “ suspend and supersede them; yet this is
 “ not done frequently, nor to be expected
 “ for the sake of sinners. God can indeed
 “ preserve man from actual death, but that
 “ a solid machine consisting of heteroge-
 “ neous parts, such as the human body
 “ is, should not be naturally mortal is
 “ impossible; ’tis a contradiction there-
 “ fore that man in the present state of
 “ things should be by nature immortal.”

Not to say any thing further concerning
 the impropriety of stiling that a native
 mortality which was not ordained in
 the beginning, and never would have
 been without an extraordinary dispensa-
 tion from the law of life and being, I
 shall only observe of suspending and super-
 seding the laws of nature, that it is too great
 a favour in general for the righteous,
 instead

instead of there being any room to expect it for the sake of sinners. The Archbishop very justly says that it is not done frequently, but according to his account it must have been the case continually in Paradise; if it had lasted, and will be throughout eternity in Heaven; the scheme of each can be nothing less than a violation of the laws of nature without end. But it is too much to determine these in every condition of being by our present state, it is much more rational to infer that whatever continuance God ordains his creatures for, he frames their substance every way agreeable thereto; if for immortality, he forms this to endure accordingly, and makes it not of such perishing materials as in the course of things must tend to speedy dissolution. These are only peculiar to the present scene, the Almighty is not tied down to such ingredients; but to consider this earthly tabernacle wherein we are said to sojourn, and not to be in our proper station, as our only natural condition, and

on the other hand our final home, the house eternal in the Heavens as contrary and repugnant to it, is in every respect to violate the laws of Reason and Religion.

But the most curious part of what the Archbishop says is the conclusion, "God can indeed preserve man from natural death, but that a solid machine such as the human body is should not be naturally mortal is impossible, &c."

This is undoubtedly true, but what instruction does it convey? That such a machine as the human body (of whatever parts it consists) must naturally be mortal, or that man in his present state must die, without a very extraordinary interposition of the Almighty to prevent it, we need no argument to prove; the only question is, What we are to learn from it? Does it imply that the body could never have been constituted otherwise than it is, or that man is incapable of existing in any other condition than he does? This is

the suggestion that it tends to, and is a presumption there would be no accounting for, if it were not a necessary consequence of the scale of being whereby whatever is must have always been, and it is impossible for things to be different from what they are; or in other words there must be some where such a rank as man, and if the present race were above this mortal state some other must be subject to it, with all the inconveniences that attend upon it. This indeed explains the meaning of such an extraordinary assertion, which I at first could not conceive the motive of, as it conveys so little information. But I have shewn the scheme which it is built upon to be entirely a false and groundless imagination, we are therefore little enlightened (as Dr. Johnson says upon the occasion) by an author, who acquaints us that man, being as he is, must undergo corruption or any other circumstance that he does, when the question to be solved is why he was so constituted; which the scale of being

professes indeed to shew by an essential fulness and inequality in the creation, but being without foundation fails egregiously of accomplishing, and leaves us utterly in the state of ignorance wherein it found us.

The same observation may be extended to all the natural evils of the present state, which (if it could be shewn essential) are certainly essential to it; but this does not any way explain the difficulty of the fundamental question, viz. why it was so ordained that it could not possibly exist without them. Yea they may not only be the unavoidable consequences of its being, but even necessary to its well being (so that it would be abundantly worse without than with them) and yet afford no satisfactory solution why this necessity of woe in order to well being was entailed upon it; which I trust I have investigated to the bottom, by shewing the impossibility of effectually excluding sorrow without its permission for a season, and the certainty

tainty of accomplishing this great event thereby for ever. This goes to the root of evil, if I may be allowed the expression, while the present scheme is miserably deficient, and teaches nothing more than every one must have known before; viz. that man being as he is cannot live otherwise than he does, or without any of those evils that are inseparably annexed to his condition; which affords not the least satisfaction why they were thus annexed to it.

What makes it still more extraordinary that the Archbishop was so fond of accounting for mortality from matter is, that he had so good a notion of its necessity from sin: for he tells us, "That it was by
 "no means expedient for the system that a
 "sinful creature should enjoy immortality;
 "yea God seems to have forbidden our
 "first parents the tree of life out of meer
 "compassion, lest if their life should by
 "virtue of it be prolonged, they should
 "live for ever miserable." [Chap. 4, sec. 9, page 200.] This

This he excellently illustrates in the sequel, but it is surprising to me how it was possible to think of it, and yet contend that death was necessary or natural to mankind according to the original law of nature; for it appears from hence that God was obliged to interpose in an extraordinary manner to deprive our first parents of immortality even after they had fallen; and so far was his supernatural power from being required to secure them this in righteousness, that on the contrary we find it manifoldly exerted to divest them of it in a state of sin. Whoever reads the original account in Genesis will be still more fully convinced of what I say; “And now
 “left he puts forth his hand and take
 “also of the tree of life, and eat there-
 “of and live for ever; therefore the
 “Lord God sent him forth from the
 “garden of Eden to till the ground from
 “whence he was taken. So he drove
 “out the man, and placed at the east
 “of the garden of Eden cherubims, and
 “a

“a flaming sword which turned every way of the tree of life.” [Gen. 3, 23 and 24 verses.]

Hence it is plain, however extraordinary it may seem, that abundant care was requisite to debar man of immortality in a state of sin, instead of being necessary to secure it him in righteousness against the laws of nature; the use of the tree of life at least would have as effectually preserved him from death (while innocent) for ever, as that of ordinary sustenance will at present for a season; which would have rendered immortality as natural as a short-lived state is now to him.

It would be tautology to insist any longer on a circumstance so striking, and that militates at all points with the Archbishop's doctrine; yet I cannot but observe one inconsistency that his own commentator confesses, chap. 4, sec. 7, page 182, where speaking of the loss of immortality
as

as a punishment, he says of it in his usual
 stile, "Neither ought we to wonder that
 "God denies the guilty a favour which
 "even the innocent have no right to;
 "yea we ought to think that he has in-
 "flicted a very light penalty on rebel-
 "lious men."

Here the commentator confesses that
 his author's argument seems to be framed
 rather in compliance with the common
 method, than in strict conformity with
 his own scheme of the *to βελτιον*, or abso-
 lute meliority in things; "Which maintains
 "that God is still infinitely beneficent,
 "or as kind as possible to all, or dispenses
 "every thing for the very best in the main.
 "Tho' what is here introduced by way of
 "punishment may, if rightly understood,
 "be defended as an instance of the greatest
 "possible kindness; since the only end of
 "all the Divine judgments is either the
 "correction and amendment of the offend-
 "ers themselves, or admonition to others,
 "or both; consequently is a means of the
 greatest

“greatest good to mankind in general, and
 “the very best dispensation toward them
 “in this degenerate corrupt estate, and the
 “most proper method of fitting them for,
 “or drawing and directing them to a
 “better.” [Note on the foregoing.]

All this I stedfastly believe, and think it would have every way answered a much better purpose, if the two learned Divines had insisted more upon it; in short, if they had entirely abandoned their own scheme of resolving natural evils into the necessity of our original condition, and pursued the common method of ascribing them to the fall, from the particulars of which, when duly comprehended, they are all to be accounted for. It seems more extraordinary to me that they did not pursue this step, as they both of them had so good a notion of the necessity of our present system from the introduction of sin, and they would thereby have avoided a most unnatural mixture of heterogeneous principles that will never cement or

coincide together. Their account would not only have been more consistent with Scripture, nature, and itself, but also more beneficial to virtue, and conducive to the purpose of reconciling evil with Divine perfection, as well as in other respects more satisfactory to our Reason.

For in the first place, what can be more serviceable to the cause of holiness and obedience, than the consideration of all our misery being derived from sin? Will any thing contribute to restrain mankind from this, if a sense of its being the universal source of sorrow will not? The learned commentator says, " I am
 " apt to think the notion that most of
 " the misery both in this world and the
 " next is the necessary consequence of our
 " sinful actions, according to the fixed laws
 " of nature, rather than any positive
 " punishment immediately inflicted by the
 " Deity will have the greatest influence
 " to deter men from such actions. And
 " the reason of this is evident, I am apt
 " still

“ still to hope the latter may possibly be
 “ remitted, but the former leaves no room
 “ for hope.” [Appendix, page 441.]

There cannot be a juster notion ; all I am amazed at is, that any man endowed with it should endeavour to extenuate the natural evils of the fall, resolve them as much as possible into the unavoidable imperfection of our original condition, and ascribe even death itself to the laws of matter that is so expressly attributed to sin, and so necessary a consequence of its introduction. If men are more deterred from disobedience by supposing misery its inevitable effect in nature than by conceiving the same its extraordinary punishment by Divine infliction, how much more will they be debarred from sin by the former consideration than by that of evil being the inseparable portion of our being from its essential inferiority in the creation? What comparison between the efficacy and virtue of the two suppositions? The one is the utmost discouragement from sin that can be, the other none at all.

G g 2 Nor

Nor is our solution of evil more beneficial only to the cause of virtue, but also more satisfactory with regard to the end of all things and honour of the Supreme Being; since the obnoxious circumstance is represented only as a temporary effect of disobedience in order to secure holiness and happiness for ever, which could not have been done without it but will be effectually accomplished thro' it. This not only affords satisfaction as to the necessity of evil, but likewise as to the certainty of its removal after a short season, the far greatest consolation as well as most illustrious circumstance to the Divine perfection, in which the scale of being, like the Socinian scheme, is wretchedly deficient. The impossibility of preventing evil according to the account of each (if it were true) is indeed sufficiently apparent, but in such manner as excludes the possibility of its extinction, as has been demonstrated of the Socinian system in the foregoing chapter. Nor is it less obvious of the scheme now in contemplation,

temptation, according to which whatever is in the constitution of things must always be, and is incapable of alteration without injury to the whole; for

—Of systems possible if 'tis confest
That wisdom infinite must form the best,
And in the scale of reasoning life 'tis plain
There must be some where such a rank as man,

then it follows that there never can be a better constitution of the universe, and the present state with all its imperfections must endure for ever. This is not only contrary to what we are taught, but robs the Creator of his greatest glory, (viz. that of finally destroying evil) and does infinitely less honour to his attributes as well as service to the cause of virtue than the scheme we recommend. Even the Manichean system sufficiently removes the moral imputation of evil from the Supreme Source of good, in whatever light it represents his power, or how little prospect soever it affords of his ultimately extirpating evil.

To

To which let me add that our solution, while it is conducive to more comfort, and in every respect to a much better end, is likewise more satisfactory to our Reason, and abundantly more conclusive to our understanding. For when we are asked why God does not hinder bad election, we are not content with saying that he could not do it consistently with the freedom of our nature; that it would be a breach of the fundamental law of liberty to moral beings, and a no less pernicious shock perhaps to the intellectual system than stopping of the sun would be to the natural: or that to deprive a rational being of free-will would be altogether as absurd and inconvenient as to endow a machine with reflection or an edifice with self-motion, which is the sort of argument the Archbishop uses, and confessed by his commentator to be very uncertain from our ignorance of the intellectual system. Page 357, and note 67. We go a vast deal further than this, even in the greatest instance of all

all bad election, that ever was and not only shew how the noblest of all creatures would have been ruined by its prevention, at least never could have been improved beyond the inevitable inconvenience of their original creation, but also how they will be advanced to the utmost possibility of perfection by the contrary permission; that there is no comparison between the evil and the good redounding from it, and that the latter could not in the nature of things have been obtained without the former.

This is illustration, whereas the other hypothesis, should we even suppose it to be founded in one respect on nature, is groundless in another, and were it ever so true as to the fact of universal fulness, and gradation, is false as to doctrine that is grafted on this. For as it pretends that no created system can subsist without subordination, so does it that subordination is the source and standard of all imperfection, imperfection of evil, &c.
the

the reverse of which we have demonstrated in the case of man and brute: the latter, tho' far inferior, having commonly less share of imperfection and evil in this life than the former: thus is every pillar the scheme has to rest upon without foundation.

In short it always hangs out a false doctrine or leaves us in utter darkness, and where it should give a positive explanation, refers the matter of enquiry to human incapacity and shortness of comprehension.

He who thro' vast immensity can pierce,
See worlds on worlds compose one universe,
Observe how system into system runs,
What other Planets circle other suns,
What varied beings people every star,
Can tell why Heaven has made us as we are.
But of this frame the bearings and the ties,
The strong connections, nice dependencies,
Gradations just, has thy pervading soul
Looked thro' ? Or can a part contain the whole ?

Such is the prevailing language of this hypothesis, and indeed the best that ever comes

comes from it, which is only an appeal to the general wisdom of the creation, and no solution of the particular difficulty in question. It brings not the exposition of evil nearer to human understanding than it was before, nor is the argument an advantage any way peculiar to the scale of being; for long before this was ever thought of, men were willing to suppose the system of creation to be right from the credit of its general wisdom, tho' they could not explain in every particular the adapting of each part to the other, or whole succession of causes and effects together. We set out in this scheme on the promised hope of receiving some positive illustration of the difficulty proposed, but after all our pains are forced to fit down without any further satisfaction than we had before. After climbing up with great labour (as Dr. Johnson very emphatically expresses it) from one step of argumentation to another, instead of ascending to the light of knowledge, we

are devolved back into dark ignorance; and all our effort ends in belief, that for the evils of life there is some good reason, and in confession that the reason cannot be found. There is no extraordinary light of any kind afforded us, unless it is that man in his present state must die, or that such a machine as the human body is cannot but be naturally mortal.

But this is not all, instead of being placed in any better situation by this scheme we are left in a far worse, and are liable to receive abundantly more harm than good from it; for if according to it

—All must full or not coherent be,

And all that rises rise in due degree,

and this in any respect should fail, or be found not to correspond with nature, it follows that the creation can have no coherence in it, and that of systems possible

possible Wisdom Infinite has not formed the best; the practice of Omniscience is in this case a direct contradiction to the plan required of it. Such is the consequence of this pretended necessity for universal fulness and gradation of being, which involves the impossibility of a vacuum; a supposition that is not only incapable of any actual proof, and therefore cannot be productive of any additional satisfaction; but is also demonstrably false in fact, and thereby destructive of the conclusion meant to be proved, viz. that whatever is, is right, in pursuance of it. It is much better to say at once without any further ceremony, on the general credit of the creation, that Infinite Wisdom must act for the best, tho' we cannot explain it as to the origin of evil in particular, than thus to clog the wheel with any further necessity of our own making, with which if nature should not coincide, there is an end of the argument from Providence at large. This is clinching of the difficulty and chaining

of ourselves down in so desperate a manner, that there is no possibility of laying hold on the only hope and comfort that men had before. The present scheme is therefore not only founded on presumption and rashness, but likewise tends to infidelity and profaneness; it is no less injurious to natural than revealed Religion, and when considered as patronized by Bolingbroke, can be esteemed in no other light than that of an idol purposely set up as a blind guide to mislead the blind.

I trust the system that has been recommended is in every respect the reverse of this; viz. that it is not founded upon arbitrary supposition or implicit trust of any kind whatever. It neither begs nor borrows from any other consideration, not even from the prevailing wisdom of the creation, but addresses itself particularly to the difficulty in question. Instead of saying God is wise, but man's a fool; which as the learned commentator observes,

serves, has very little tendency (tho' it may be true) to the conviction of an infidel or satisfaction of a believer; instead of urging any thing like this, it speaks directly to the human capacity and comprehension, and vindicates the ways of God to man as it would do those of one man to another. Where the other scheme supposes

All discord harmony not understood,

All partial evil universal good,

and thus, notwithstanding all its pretences, is at last an argument *ad ignorantiam*, or imperfection of man's understanding; this shews precisely where the real harmony of apparent discord lies, and how the partial evil of this short-lived state contributes to the universal, everlasting good of the whole intellectual system. We do not any way evade the question,

If storms and tempests break not Heaven's design,
Why then a Borgia or a Catiline?

On

On the other hand, we answer it immediately, without recourse to analogy for a solution, or offence to virtue, which is of much greater consequence; in both which particulars the other scheme is egregiously defective. As to the first advantage of our hypothesis, it scruples not at once to say, that Providence often permits the utmost depth of depravity in this transient state, in order to inspire the blessed with the greatest detestation of all sin throughout eternity in Heaven. This is a suitable and sufficient cause apparent from the very nature of the thing, and is a much more direct answer to the question, why a Borgia or a Catiline, than can be had from storms and tempests, earthquakes, or unknown worlds; in short what the other scheme proposes by the most distant means, this accomplishes by the most obvious, and is an instance how the plainest methods may succeed, where the most learned, far-fetched, and laborious fail.

But

But what is the greatest happiness of our system is, that while it represents in the strongest light the necessity of vice in order to the everlasting welfare of the universe, it no way diminishes the banefulness and odium of the thing in itself; but founds the advantage of its temporary permission on the unalterable perniciousness of its nature, and the eternal abhorrence to be created by sensible experience of this for a season. This is widely different from what is often done on the other scheme, wherein men, in order to acquit Providence of any concern in moral evil, go a great way to destroy the substance of the thing; by placing it in the same predicament with other particulars, which (however disagreeable) are highly necessary to the being and even well-being of our present nature. Thus the poet says,

If the great end be human happiness,
 Then nature deviates, and can man do less?
 As much that end a constant course requires
 Of showers and sunshine as of man's desires;
 As much eternal springs and cloudless skies,
 As men for ever temperate, calm, and wise.

The

The intention of which is to insinuate, that the great end of human happiness does not more require a constant course of storms and sunshine, than it does of vice and virtue; that both the latter are not less essential to our immediate welfare than the former, or that eternal springs and cloudless skies are not more inconsistent with it than men for ever temperate, calm, and wise. Whatever may be the case at present, I hope this will not be hereafter; but whether we ever shall subsist with eternal springs and cloudless skies or not, that men for ever temperate, calm, and wise, will not be found such contradictions to the great end of human happiness as they are here supposed. That such is the poet's meaning is plain enough from the passage tho' the expression is confused, but if there could be any doubt of this, the Archbishop will supply us with another instance to the same effect, chap. 5, sect. 5, page 411, &c; where he tells us, "That as in music dis-
 "cords, if heard separately, grate and of-
 "fend the ear with harshness, but when
 mixed

" mixed in consort with other notes make
 " the more sweet and agreeable harmony ;
 " in like manner bad elections, if considered
 " alone, are looked upon as odious and
 " detestable, but compared with the whole
 " system, they promote and increase the
 " good and beauty of the whole. For
 " when they are tempered they become
 " medicinal to each other by their very
 " contrariety, and those which would
 " poison separate, when mixed become a
 " remedy. For instance, one by a depraved
 " choice raises an immense sum of money
 " and a vast estate, and either the same
 " person or his heir, by his vanity and pro-
 " fuseness, compensates for what he had
 " acquired by his extortion, and perhaps
 " does as much good by squandering away
 " his ill-gotten wealth to the most idle
 " purposes, as if he had bestowed all
 " upon the poor. For he applies a spur
 " to industry, whereas he would otherwise
 " afford a handle to sloth. The rich man
 " offends in luxury and idleness ; the poor
 " transgresses no less by too much labour

“and solicitude, which he indulges perhaps
 “for no other end than to provide in-
 “struments of luxury for the rich; but
 “each of them pleases himself in his choice,
 “and ’tis almost the same thing with re-
 “spect to the benefit of the universe, as
 “if one had converted to pious uses what
 “he spent in luxury, and the other had
 “laboured moderately to provide only
 “what is useful. The same almost may be
 “said of all vices, they are prejudicial
 “but only to the criminals themselves,
 “yea, they are often beneficial to
 “others, &c.”

I cannot but consider all such argument
 as destructive of the fundamental dis-
 tinction between vice and virtue, whereby
 the former is esteemed invariably produc-
 tive of misery, the latter of happiness
 at large in proportion as it prevails, tho’
 in this mixt estate the distribution is very
 unequal among individuals according to
 their respective merits. The foregoing
 is an absolute inversion of this essential
 rule,

rule, and makes virtue vice, vice virtue, as to its effect; at least represents vice as prejudicial only to the vicious, and nearly of as beneficial consequence to the community as virtue, which it is most injurious to. But it is a very bad method to acquit the Supreme Being of any concern in moral evil by explaining away the thing itself, or to apologize for Providence in the permission of sin by confounding the tendency of it in general with that of virtue; such reasoning is much more suitable to Libertines than Divines, to Bolingbroke and Mandeville than the Archbishop and his commentator, and is another instance of the many extremes men are liable to in the present question; how it is surrounded on all sides with dangers, so that in avoiding one they are almost inevitably driven into another. We have seen how variously they have offended against the attributes of the Divine Being on this account, and diminished his omniscience or omnipotence in order to magnify his

VOL. II. I i 2 goodness;

goodness, we shall now see how manifoldly they have erred with respect to virtue from the same cause if we recollect, how in order to obviate natural evil they have been for making it of no consequence in comparison with virtue, and for advancing the latter above its end by representing it of greater consideration than the happiness it was ordained to be subservient to. Thus they have apologized for injury by its necessity to patience, misfortune to compassion, and the like; forgetting, as we observed, that the evils are in general but badly recompensed by the virtues, tho' where the former are unavoidable, the latter are undoubtedly the best remedies that can be recommended for the relief of them. The present is a quite contrary attempt to reconcile men to evil, viz. by diminishing the benefit of virtue and exalting vice as nearly of equal advantage with it to the constitution of things at large. The one makes a sacrifice of happiness to virtue, the other of virtue to vice on account of
of

of happiness, and in order to make out the scheme of universal good at last; such are the opposite extremes men have been guilty of with respect to virtue, as well as the Divine attributes, to reconcile this perplexing phenomenon of evil, while it is the happiness of our system that it is safe from all these rocks, and no more offends by unduly magnifying or diminishing the cause of holiness, than any of the Divine Perfections. While we reject the rant of confounding virtue with its end, by representing it the supreme good of nature in itself, we properly support its dignity by maintaining its indispensable necessity toward this; and tho' we contend for the temporal necessity of sin in order to our eternal welfare, yet it is in such manner as no way lessens the absolute perniciousness or just abhorrence of the thing; on the contrary we enhance them, both by representing vice as suffered for no other purpose then its own extinction, and

and shewing that, there is no harmony or music in the discord but as it ministers to its own destruction.

Thus there is no harm in the proposition that

Respecting man whatever wrong we call May, must be right as relative to all.

Our system terminates in the same conclusion with the scale of being, but without changing or confounding the nature of right and wrong. There is also another very material difference between them, viz. as to the extent of the doctrine; our's taking in a far nobler, larger whole, and referring rectitude to the end of all things; not confining itself to the present state of the universe, but casting a retrospect to the beginning, and looking forward from thence to the consummation of the intellectual system; which is at least as necessary to vindicate the ways of God to man as to look thro' the circle of created being.

being. The consideration of immensity is a very imperfect view without adding that of eternity to the subject.

But the most striking proof of the superiority of our scheme, and what most eminently concurs to shew the advantage of it is, that the Archbishop and his commentator themselves so frequently recur to it, tho' as the latter observes upon the former it is a direct deviation from his own system. Thus the commentator says in note 55, that his author's account of evil from sin in certain instances is rather framed in compliance with the common method than in strict conformity with his own scheme of the *το βελτιον*, or absolute meliority in things; but corrects himself and incurs the same contradiction by saying, tho' what is here introduced by way of punishment may, if rightly understood, be defended as an instance of the greatest possible kindness, the very best dispensation toward mankind in this degenerate

degenerate estate, and the most proper method of fitting them for a better.

This inconsistency is more fully apparent from many other notes, wherein are advanced such noble observations, if they were not blended and confounded with those of a contrary nature, that I cannot but produce the passages both for the excellency of the sentiments and to shew how this was lost by a superior attention to a bad scheme. Thus he says in note 38, page 189. "Tho' the first
 "man might have been created more perfect in all his faculties than any of his
 "posterity (which as some think cannot
 "easily be proved from the account we
 "have of him in Genesis) tho' his knowledge might have been much clearer
 "as coming entire and adult from the
 "immediate hand of the Creator; yet
 "it seems highly probable that this could
 "not have been propagated in a natural
 "way, that is by any general, pre-established laws, as our present faculties
 "are;

“are; but mankind as a successive body
“must necessarily have been left to the
“known laws of propagation, and the
“present method of improving their in-
“tellects, and deriving all their notice
“from the common sources of sensation
“and reflection. And so our bountiful
“Creator may be supposed to have de-
“prived mankind of no blessings he could,
“consistent with his other attributes and
“the order of the creation, possibly have
“bestowed. Yea, why may not he be
“thought to have converted even this
“necessary, unavoidable imperfection in
“us, compared with the first Adam, in-
“to a greater perfection, arising both from
“our notions of his fall and the conse-
“quences of it, and of the wonderful re-
“medy prepared for it and promised in
“the second Adam? We seem to be
“made more highly sensible of the in-
“finite wisdom and goodness of God,
“and more thankful for our condition
“from our knowledge of his just per-
“mission of so deserved a fall, and his
VOL. II. K k “gracious,

"gracious, undeserved exaltation of us
 "again to a superior state, than if we had
 "conceived the misery attending human
 "nature to be (as perhaps most of it was)
 "a necessary consequence of our being
 "created in this inferior class."

Here it is remarkable that in the beginning of the note he argues on his own scheme of questioning the fall, and contends, that even if the first man were created more perfect in his faculties than his posterity (which is hinted to be very doubtful) yet this could not have been propagated in a natural way, but mankind as a successive body must have been left to the known laws of propagation and the present methods of improvement. Yea he goes so far as to suppose the Creator may have deprived mankind of no blessings that he could, consistently with his other attributes and the order of creation, have bestowed. How then can God be supposed to have converted any necessary, unavoidable imperfection in us,

compared

compared with the first Adam, into a greater perfection arising from our notions of his fall and the consequences of it? This is arguing on the presumption of what the commentator had been before impugning; for if Adam's perfection could not have been propagated in a natural way, and God may be supposed to have deprived mankind of no blessings that he could, according to the order of creation, possibly have bestowed, what are the consequences of the fall, or how can we receive any greater perfection from our notions of it or them, when there were no consequences at all occasioned by it? The commentator observes that we seem to be made more highly sensible of the wisdom and goodness of God from our knowledge of his just permission of so deserved a fall, &c. than if we conceived the misery attending human nature to be a necessary consequence of our being created in this inferior class. But if he meant to make any advantage of such supposition, why does he invali-

date it with a parenthesis containing a conjecture to the contrary as to the greatest part of evil? There is no advantage of a medley, when the ingredients will not mix together, but one of them so far as it prevails must necessarily confound and destroy the other. If there be any merit in this observation of the fall, the scheme that the commentator has pursued in general is a flat contradiction to it.

The next passage I shall produce, both for its excellency and imperfection, is part of note X, page 363, in which is said, "God may be conceived to have permitted Adam to fall not only for the reasons above, but likewise because it was better for him upon the whole than if he had been kept from the act of guilt by an invifible force. He had no reason to presume this, but the power of God is so great that he brought good out of evil, and made Adam's state after his fall more advantageous to him than innocence had been. This
" is

“ is plain from holy Scripture that pre-
 “ fers our state under the second Adam
 “ to what it was under the first. And
 “ as it was better for Adam himself, so
 “ it is not certain but it was best for his
 “ posterity. For some of them it un-
 “ doubtedly was, I mean those that are
 “ found in Christ; and as to the rest,
 “ it doth not appear but all things con-
 “ sidered it was as good for them too.
 “ We have a notion that if Adam had not
 “ fallen, all his posterity would have con-
 “ tinued innocent, and been free from all
 “ natural inconveniencies; but the author
 “ shews that neither the holy Scripture
 “ nor the Catholic Church has determined
 “ either of them; nor is it said how every
 “ one that was to be born would have used
 “ his free-will if he had been tried, nor that
 “ even those who used it right would have
 “ been subject to no natural evil. There-
 “ fore 'tis a very uncertain argument that
 “ is drawn from these suppositions, and
 “ ought not to be opposed to the goodness
 “ of God.”

The

The greatest part of this observation is a remote conjecture and surmise of what I trust has been duly proved and demonstrated at large; viz. that the fall of Adam was more advantageous to him and the blessed among his posterity than innocence had been, that it was in all respects far better for the constitution of the universe than if the corruption of mankind had never happened, and that it is a vain supposition that if their first parents had not fallen they would have been ever free from it themselves. These are notions faintly here expressed which I flatter myself have been manifested in the foregoing chapter to the life; as they appear however in the present passage they are noble suggestions beyond what I have elsewhere met with, and would have been much better if the author had not weakened them after his usual manner by a diminution of the fall, and an intimation that if this had not happened even they who used their freedom properly would not have been exempt from
natural

natural evil. For whether this would have been the case or not, certainly there cannot any argument be drawn against the goodness of God from the supposition of his making sin the sole cause of evil; the latter of which would not have been without the former, and both of them were permitted for a short season only in order to insure thereby the contrary qualities of righteousness and happiness for ever. The noblest idea we can entertain of evil is that it was ordained for no other purpose than the establishment of order; what reflection then it can be on the Divine Being to suppose that without disobedience it never would have been at all, and was instituted wholly on account of its necessity for the removal of this, I do not conceive; how any such consideration of evil being derived from sin, and directed to the great end of confirming men in the perfection and felicity of their nature, can possibly be opposed to the goodness of God, is a mystery beyond my comprehension. The

The last passage I shall produce to the foregoing purpose is part of note 81, which says, "Perhaps such a scheme
 "as this of the fall appears to be, from
 "the representation given of it and its
 "effect in Scripture, was necessary to make
 "us duly sensible of the nature of good and
 "evil, to acquaint us more fully with the
 "moral perfections of the Deity (which
 "could not have been so clearly exhibited
 "to us if there never had been any room
 "for the exercise of them) and consequently to bring us to an imitation of
 "these perfections, and thereby to the
 "greatest and most refined happiness
 "our better part is capable of." In the next page is added, "What if God, willing to make known the greater riches
 "of his glory, suffered our first parents
 "to fall soon from that condition wherein
 "he created them at first, in order to
 "raise them and their posterity to a much
 "higher state of glory and true happiness
 "after? And who can prove that the former was not conducive to the latter?

"We

“ We believe that the blifs of Heaven
 “ will infinitely exceed the pleasures of
 “ a terreftrial Eden ; Why then fhould we
 “ not fuppofe that the lefs might be in
 “ fome meafure ufeful and introductory
 “ to the greater ? Why might not a fhort
 “ life in Paradife be a proper ftate of pro-
 “ bation for the virtues of this prefent
 “ world, as this world is for the glories
 “ of another ? ”

My intention in producing this is not
 to cavil, but to exhibit it as the beft ob-
 fervation of the kind that I have met
 with, while at the fame time I cannot
 but obferve the faintnefs of the conjecture
 and the error as well as imperfection
 that is blended with it. That our firft
 parents were fuffered to fall fo foon from
 the condition wherein they were at firft
 created in order to raife them and their
 pofterity to a much higher ftate of glory is
 an illuftrious fentiment, but how weakly
 enforced by asking, And who can prove
 that the former was not conducive to

the latter? We think we have directly proved it was, and as to the further question, Why may not a short life in Paradise be a proper state of probation for the virtues of the present world, as this is for the glories of another? Here we think the implication will not hold. The less, as is observed, may be useful and introductory to a greater, but how the superior state of Paradise should be a probation for the virtues of the present world is not easy to be imagined; how a speedy fall from one to the other may advance men to the kingdom of Heaven that is infinitely above either has been fully shewn, whence the benefit of both is evident.

After this the learned commentator makes many excellent observations in the same note, which he concludes as follows: "Hence it will appear that we
 "have reason to suppose that the fall
 "of man from earthly and animal delights
 "was designed to raise him to a rational
 and

“and heavenly state of happiness, and
 “to make way for such a wonderful display of all the Divine attributes in that
 “expedient, as could not have been exhibited at all, or not in so high a degree
 “without it; and consequently that this
 “method was the very best even for
 “our own system. But if this supposition
 “seem improbable or insufficient, yet
 “why may not all the misery in this
 “system of our’s promote and increase
 “the happiness of some other. We have
 “good reason to believe that there is some
 “connection between the different systems
 “of the universe; but have small ground
 “to imagine our’s the best; why then may
 “it not be subservient to a better? This
 “indeed is only conjecture, however I
 “think it would be no easy matter to confute it; ’till which is done we may very
 “safely conclude with our author that
 “the fall itself, as well as the sin and misery
 “consequent upon it, could not have been
 “prevented without greater detriment to
 “the whole; and one may say of Eve the

“fame as the poet did of the hand of Mu-
 “tius Scœvola; Si non errasset, fecerat
 “illa minus.”

As much as I approve the matter of this observation, I cannot but condemn the cold and distant manner in which 'tis urged; *we have reason to suppose the fall the very best method even for our own system, but if this supposition seem improbable or insufficient, yet why may not all the misery of our's promote and increase the happiness of some other?* If it were not the best for our own system, we should have very little encouragement to presume this of it for any other; nothing could be more improbable or remote than such conclusion, but it is perfectly agreeable to the scale of being, of which it is the peculiar property to build upon any supposition however far-fetched as a certain fact that cannot be demonstrated as a falsehood; or as Dr. Johnson says, “To
 “talk to us concerning benefits of evil
 “which no man feels, and relations be-
 “tween

" tween distant parts of the universe
 " which no man can conceive. As that
 " pain, however inflicted or wherever
 " felt, communicates some good to the
 " general system of being, and that every
 " animal is some way or other the better
 " for the pain of every other animal,
 " in the same manner as attraction is com-
 " municated to all corporeal nature. Thus
 " the evils suffered upon this globe may
 " by some means or other communicate
 " to the felicity of the inhabitants of the
 " remotest planet."

Such proceeding, I say, is very suit-
 able to the scale of being, and fully en-
 titles it to another description given of
 it by the same author, viz. that never
 was any system more hypothetical, or
 hypothesis more absurd. It is a mode
 of reflection however by no means ap-
 plicable to the fall, the first thing that
 occurs from which is the direct benefit
 of it to our own system by the sensible
 experience of evil from sin it occasions,
 and

and the next the similar advantage that superior beings must be capable of deriving from observation of the fact. The immediate appearance of it is like that of the sun to this world, which from its absolute necessity and abundant service we are apt to imagine ordained for the earth alone; but as more extensive observation teaches us that the sun was designed for the welfare of many orbs superior to our own, so further consideration equally assures us that the advantage of our present system thro' Redemption is not confined to us, but communicated to many higher and more illustrious orders of existence. This is proceeding in a direct line, and when the service of evil to our own nature is once made fully manifest, there is good foundation laid for the like conclusion with respect to other beings, even if it were not so demonstrable as it is in fact. But when the presumption of its utility to ourselves is given up as improbable or insufficient, that of its advantage to other systems

systems must be still more extravagant and distant ; as men cannot but be blind indeed to the service of the sun to Saturn, if they were not sensible of its affording any benefit to their own globe.

I hope I have not been guilty of any disrespect in these observations to the Archbishop or his commentator, for both of whom I have a great esteem, especially the latter, who I believe has given the best hints of the scheme I would wish to recommend that have been hitherto suggested. I have not met with any man that has come up to them, and if he had placed his chief dependance upon these, as he did on others that are inconsistent with them, his success would have been much greater than it is. But while he seems to me to have made the best improvements on the solution of evil from the fall, his recommendation of it was far inferior to its merit ; the noblest part of his observation is a contradiction to his general design, and he has put the greatest

greatest stress on that which deserved none at all, the least on that which was entitled to his utmost confidence. Why he should thus choose to lay his foundation on the sand when he might have fixed it on a rock, and prefer the worse with the better scheme in view, when the only merit of the former was that it tended to undermine the latter, is very extraordinary and amazing! That Bolingbroke should be so fond of it is very easy to be accounted for, it being in all probability his design, under the specious pretext that whatever is right, to remove the necessity of repairing wrong, and all idea of a renovation for this purpose. Nor is it any wonder that Pope should be drawn into the snare, than which nothing could be more deeply laid to captivate the blind side of a religious person; as it professes the utmost complaisance to Providence, by supposing this incapable of permitting any thing but what is right in itself at present, and resolving every appearance to the contrary into wisdom that is infinitely past finding

finding out. The truth is that he was seduced by the bait of orthodoxy, there was no occasion for his universal prayer to vindicate the innocence of his intention; the scheme he fell into was the same as was laid by Satan to persuade our Saviour to cast himself down from the temple of Jerusalem, viz. unlimited trust in the Almighty where he has given no such authority by his word, but on the contrary forbidden all such presumption. This is equally applicable to the doctrine of universal rectitude where we are taught the necessity of so great an alteration and amendment, the only difference is that Pope had not sagacity enough to see through it; which shews how necessary the subtilty of the serpent is as well as the simplicity of the dove, and is a lasting admonition to well meaning persons to beware of too great a regard for mystery, since it is not every pretence of this any more than Reason that in reality is favourable to Christianity.

It must be confessed however that the motive of the Archbishop and his commentator was as different from that of Pope as Bolingbroke, and was no more to recommend implicit faith than to undermine the foundation of a future state ; but on the contrary to solve the difficulty of evil without aid of Scripture, and thereby strike at the root of Bayle's assertion, that it could not be reconciled with the pretended perfections of the Deity upon any principles of nature. Thus the Archbishop, after hinting in a passage before cited, " That the perniciousness " of wild beasts might have had its origin " from the fall, and rage been given " to the lion, venom to the serpent, for " the punishment of mankind," subjoins ; " But as this question was first moved by " such as either denied Revelation or at " least were ignorant of it, I would not " call that into our assistance, or make any " other use of it than as a bare hypothesis." In like manner the commentator after explaining and commending his author's scheme

scheme in the preface says (page 11,) "I
 " heartily wish this method had been
 " taken by more of those who have
 " written on the present subject, and the
 " argument pursued a little further by
 " natural light, in order to give some
 " light and confirmation even to Reve-
 " lation itself in these inquisitive days,
 " wherein a great many seem unwilling
 " to be determined by its sole authority.
 " Even the most learned and ingenious
 " writer on this subject often flies to Scrip-
 " ture when a difficulty begins to press
 " him; which in my opinion is deserting of
 " the argument and owning with Mr. Bayle
 " that it cannot be defended on any other
 " footing. Whereas if the difficulty be
 " really unanswerable by Reason, or a plain
 " contradiction to our natural notions of
 " God; if as the fore-mentioned author
 " often urges, we perceive by our clear
 " and distinct ideas that such a thing is en-
 " tirely repugnant to his nature and attri-
 " butes, referring of us to Scripture, which
 " declares that an infinitely perfect Being

“ did constitute it thus, will be no manner
 “ of satisfaction ; since upon this supposi-
 “ tion we cannot have greater assurance
 “ that this Scripture comes from him than
 “ we have that the doctrine therein con-
 “ tained is impossible and absurd.”

This is a just observation, but alas!
 how nearly do the most opposite extremes
 approach together, and how prone are
 men in avoiding one to precipitate them-
 selves into another that is equally as
 bad? It is very true that in an argu-
 ment of this kind we are not to employ
 the sole authority of Scripture, especially
 with unbelievers, which has been done
 too commonly by Divines; but this is no
 reason why we should totally reject its use,
 nor is a system by any means to be deem-
 ed the worse for an hypothesis because
 it comes from Revelation. It is upon an
 equal footing as such with any other, and
 if it answer the intended purpose of solu-
 tion better, is not only to be valued more
 highly in itself, but also on account of
 its original; as having some foundation
 at

at least, besides that of its own recommendation, to depend upon. This is widely different from laying our whole stress on the bare word of Scripture, which is at last as good as any meer assertion of our own; had the scale of being been more manifest than the fall from nature, or afforded a more satisfactory account of the difficulty proposed in Reason, there would have been some cause for departing from Revelation in pursuance of it. But when the contrary is evident in both respects, and it fails thus egregiously in every instance of Philosophy; when instead of being better recommended either by this or history, there is not a greater romance in nature, and it requires tenfold the faith of Revelation to digest it, what possible motive was there for adopting it? Nothing but an excessive apprehension of the fault committed by the ingenious writer alluded to could have drawn the two learned authors into the extreme of thus pursuing a scheme which has every thing against it, but that it comes not recommended by the Scripture. Whether

ther this be any better method of proceeding than the other, or rather serve not (as the commentator charges that) to betray the cause, to undermine the authority of both Reason and Revelation, and to make a person that argues consequentially reject all kinds of Religion, I leave the reader to determine. However cautious we should be of arguing from the sole authority of Scripture, yet where it makes mystery philosophy and darkness light by explaining what would be inexplicable without it, we certainly should glory in its account, and magnify the original. The solution of evil from sin would have done credit to the Coran had it been found there, nor would it have failed in such case of being extolled by infidels against the gospel; but if they are determined to believe any thing before this, (of which their predilection for the scale of being is a sufficient proof) let not us be so mean and servile as to gratify them in their ungracious humours, be bashful of what we should boast, or turn aside, as if ashamed from what we should contend for

for as our greatest honour. It is my happiness that the scheme proposed is borrowed entirely from the Scripture, and such doctrines of it in particular as are scarce, if any more regarded than those of the Coran; from such as are esteemed the least comely parts of Revelation, and not only treated most contemptuously by its adversaries, but also most industriously avoided and concealed by its advocates in general; nor do I consider a deduction from such unpromising circumstances of the faith (whatever Bayle might have said) as less than a demonstration from the principles of Reason. This is at least the most likely method to accomplish the reconciliation of evil, if ever it be done before the restoration of all things; viz. by strictly pursuing the system of Revelation (however perplexing it appears) after the manner in which philosophers have of late investigated that of nature; instead of devising schemes as they did at first to make it according to their own fancy, and following any wild imagination rather than inspecting into the real
state

state of things, from the disagreeableness of its superficial aspect. The bad success that has hitherto attended the endeavours of Divines, I think, needs not any other circumstance to account for it than their continuance in this misconduct, whatever may be the consequence of the present attempt to rectify it.

B O O K III.

ON THE CHANGES OF DIVINE PROVIDENCE AT THE FALL; THEIR NATURAL RELATION TO EACH OTHER, AND UNIVERSAL TENDENCY TO REDEMPTION.

CHAPTER I.

ON THE INCREASE OF ISSUE.

WE have hitherto been engaged on the great considerations of sin and evil, as they relate to universal nature, were inevitable from the beginning, and are necessary to the completion of all social being; nothing less than the original, administration, and end of the whole intellectual system has been the subject of our contemplation, but we must now contract it within narrower bounds, and confine our enquiry to the peculiar circumstances of our present state. I mean hereby the changes that were immediately occasioned to the human species by

the fall, which we shall find adapted in wisdom and goodness purely to the sinful condition they had sunk into, and in every particular concurring with what has been said of this at large; viz. to shew that as it was necessary in itself, so was not there any thing instituted thereupon but what was absolutely essential to it. This I trust is proceeding in due form and order, first to explain the exigency of a thing in general, and afterward that of every circumstance belonging to it; the latter will come in very properly to finish and compleat the former, whereas if the substance be neglected (which has been too much the case) the remaining part of the work will be very superficial and defective. It is but of little consequence to shew that all the appendages of the present life are ever so well suited to each other, 'till men are reconciled to the expediency of the state itself, and imperfection that is entailed on it at large; but when the main point is secured, it answers a considerable end to prove, that there is not any one particular

particular relating to our corrupt condition but what is altogether as essential to it, as this is to the whole constitution of our being, and that of every other creature among the blessed. We have arrived in one sense at the full extent of our enquiry, there is no going beyond the beginning and end of all things; what remains is to fill up the intermediate space and finish the great out-line by a view of the particulars which it was drawn on the presumption of, and which in the pursuit of the main cause there was not sufficient opportunity and leisure to enlarge upon. For these are not only corroborating circumstances, but were in fact the grounds that led to our first enquiry. I should never have suspected that the fall was necessary to the kingdom of Heaven, had it not previously appeared to me that every incident ascribed by Moses to the former was essential to our present life; the principal conclusion came to me by this subordinate induction, which has not been proved but only pre-

fumed as yet, viz. that every act of Divine Providence at the fall was calculated for the good of man according to the situation he had sunk into. This was the foundation of all that has been advanced upon satisfaction, sin, and judgment, has therefore need to be well fortified and secured; as it was the first occasion of our theory, and will finally tend to the confirmation of this, it will be highly proper to display at large the origin of our enquiry, by a minute attention to each change that is attributed to the Supreme Being. However inferior therefore the following circumstances may appear in comparison with the foregoing considerations, and even unconnected for a time with the principal end in view; yet will the most diminutive and distant of them be found ultimately to concur in the same point by demonstrating, that as there was nothing permitted on the fall but what was necessary, (however obnoxious) in itself, so was there nothing done by the Divine Being but what was placidly adapted to
this

this exigency ; every incident thereof in particular was conducive to the temporal as well as the event at large to the eternal benefit and advantage of the species. Besides this we shall shew another connection between some of the changes that has not hitherto been much suspected.

The first of the institutions mentioned with regard to the human species is what God says to the woman, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow *and* thy conception, Gen. iii. 6; which I presume denotes an increase of pregnancy as well as pain. This is a circumstance I believe which is not much attended to, the passage being usually understood as if it were said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow in thy conception; but perhaps it may be questioned whether the trouble that is here alluded to have any relation to child bearing, the pains of this being particularly mentioned in the succeeding sentence, in sorrow shalt thou bring forth. That which is first proposed then may mean
nothing

nothing more than the affliction which the woman is ordained to undergo in common with the man; but if it should be deemed to signify the sickness of conception, as the last does the anguish of delivery, yet it cannot I think be doubted that the passage intimates an increase of conception as well as sorrow, by any who duly consider the application of the word *multiply* to each circumstance in the disjunctive.

If this be admitted it will point out a peculiar provision for the establishment which was necessary to follow, and serve as a small specimen of what will be more fully manifested in the sequel; viz. how the circumstances of the fall which are commonly overlooked or considered as unconnected bear relation, and thereby reciprocal testimony to each other. For what more apparent than that when God determined to ordain this transitory and successive state, it became incumbent on him to establish a much more numerous increase in order to preserve the world replenished

replenished than before was necessary when mankind were to have been immortal? When the decree was passed, that however the earth might at any time be filled, yet all who dwell on it should in a short course of years be swept off to the grave, it followed that a suitable number must be ordained to rise up continually in their stead within the narrow period of their days. The world must now become desolate, if not re-peopled every age; whereas while men remained free from death and diminution, however slowly population might have then advanced, it would have been always on the increase, a consequence directly opposite to what must have ensued at present without greatly adding to the propagation that before was requisite. There is every reason then to imagine that the effect was in each condition adapted to the exigency of the case, and the multiplicity of conception after the fall entirely founded on the circumstance of mortality to follow, which tho' so obvious in itself is not a matter that has been much observed. Nothing

Nothing indeed can be more just and accurate than the Scripture is in this particular of issue as to all the three estates of men, the past, the present, and the future. When the Sadducees asked our Saviour concerning the woman who had seven husbands, whose wife she should be at the resurrection, his answer was, ye err not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God; at the renovation they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels. Thus is the establishment to come very suitably made to differ from both the others; in the beginning God said, increase and multiply and replenish the earth; because tho' the race was framed for immortality, yet there being only a single pair created, there was a necessity for considerable, tho' not by any means so speedy propagation in order to the end proposed. This was greatly multiplied upon the fall in pursuance of the principle it was at first ordained upon, which otherwise must have failed and thereby the kingdom of Heaven not been sufficiently

sufficiently supplied; at the consummation however, when the number of the saints shall be both accomplished and subject to no future diminution, the end of ordaining offspring then entirely ceasing, the thing itself will of course be discontinued with all the interests and connections appertaining to it. It will not go on ad infinitum, or exceed the purpose it was designed for, so as to require a translation to any further system, according to what has been imagined upon principles very similar to those of the Sadducaical objection; which shews again how much more exact and pertinent the Scripture is than the observations that have been made upon it.

B O O K III.

CHAPTER II.

ON THE OBLIGATION OF LABOUR ENTAILED ON MAN.

AFTER I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception, in sorrow shalt thou bring forth, the text adds: "And thy desire shall be to thy husband and he shall rule over thee."

With great propriety is the conclusion added, for as mortality gave occasion for multiplicity of offspring, so is this in conjunction with the sorrow of woman in travail a ground-work of subjection to her and toil to man. These things are equally united, tho' in a different manner from the others we have been explaining; increase of issue follows not, as far as we perceive, by any natural consequence from mortality, but by extraordinary

dinary appointment of the Deity in conformity with the exigency of things; whereas the multiplicity and sorrow of travail are themselves the executive instruments and means of subjection to the woman, and labour to the man; both these are spontaneous effects of the former, and flow as regularly from them as streams do from their proper fountains.

Moses I know has been supposed to have entertained us with a fable, and not a very plausible or judicious one, in relation to the establishments upon the fall; but that this has arisen totally from want of penetration to discern the coherence, depth, and accuracy of the account, I trust will in a short time be further shewn. It is not an arbitrary, dramatic fiction of the voice of God, but a most philosophical and profound description of the operation of his hands; his word is manifested by his works in this case, where it has little been imagined or understood, which is a strong confirmation of the history.

Should we insist on the veracity of Moses from what he says of God ordaining sorrow and death, it might be answered that the effects in themselves are obvious, must have proceeded from his appointment, and it requires no great art to frame an account of their introduction; but when a connection between circumstances is shewn to have been intimated which has yet remained unsuspected, his adversaries must needs admire the superior wisdom of the narration. The natural consequence of subjection to woman from the frequency and sorrow of child bearing our author points out in a masterly manner by the succession he ordains it after these things in the text, leaving us to adopt the hint and improve upon the suggestion given. The misfortune has been however that men have had wit sufficient to ridicule the relation, but not to comprehend the profound sense and meaning that lies comprehended in it; as will appear when we shall have considered the several fundamentals of subordination that proceed from pregnancy

pregnancy in its present state. This has a much more extensive influence over the mind as well as body than it is obvious to imagine; it is scarce conceivable 'till it has been displayed how deeply rooted the decree, thy desire shall be to thy husband and he shall rule over thee, is in the previous determination. I will greatly multiply thy conception, and in sorrow shalt thou bring forth. There is not only a declaration of inferiority, but likewise demonstration in the passage.

The process I purpose to pursue in examining the three particulars of child-bearing, subordination, and labour, will be somewhat different from the order that they bear in the sacred writings; there subjection follows next to pregnancy, for both being ordained for woman, they are of course declared in conjunction to her, and the representation of toil is deferred till the man whose peculiar portion this was to be, has his allotment given him. I choose to discourse

course however on his obligation to labour first, because it follows much more immediately from the circumstances of travail to woman than every particular that relates to her subordination ; indeed the difficulty attending child-bearing is a principal cause of the great incumbrance of toil to man, which contributes again to the establishment and completion of subjection to the woman ; so that the prior manifestation of the one, as we propose, is a necessary step in our way to the demonstration of the other.

With respect to the burden of labour then, there is nothing more certain than that whatever may be the lot of some, mankind at large must be supported by their industry ; the earth yields not her means of sustenance with ease, they are only to be acquired by great assiduity, and there are comparatively but few among the human race, who find not a considerable degree of toil expedient for the welfare of their subsistence. This is,

I think so obvious that I need say nothing more concerning it ; whatever may have been the occasion of the thing, the effect is undeniable, that the species must be content at present to eat their bread in the sweat of their brow, and thereby alone is it now attainable by the generality.

From necessity of labour for support in general let us now proceed then to examine how it is entailed upon the man particularly ; and this we shall not be long at a loss to explain, if we only direct our eye to the consequences of child-bearing. Such is the disability occasioned by it that it necessarily debars the sex it is ordained to from all employments difficult or arduous ; their principal concern must be confined to themselves, can only extend to light, domestic affairs at farthest ; neither distant expeditions abroad nor laborious fatigues at home are any way compatible with the sickness and danger that are the constant companions

companions of this situation. Not only when the time of travail advances are women unable to support themselves without the helping hand of men, but long before this approaches, do they often find themselves so oppressed with the weight of their incumbrance as to be insufficient for any such exertions as are necessary to subsistence; even children almost may as well sustain themselves without their parents as they in pregnancy without the assistance of their consorts. Let any person only cast his eye toward the cottages of the lower class, the far most numerous order of society, and then say whether the one sex must not almost entirely depend upon the other in such condition, or what would be the fate of the weaker vessels when deprived of or abandoned by the authors of their conception without any other aids of the community. Is it not apparent then as Moses represents, that when God ordained the present course of gestation to the female he

he at the same time established toil particularly on the male, a larger portion of this devolving on him in consequence of the former, he being thereby compelled to fulfil his own share of employment with that of his companion in great measure likewise.

This will appear still more conspicuous when we further consider the consequences of gestation; for the woman is no sooner released from this than nurture of course succeeds, which tho' it be not so dangerous, is not less an obstacle to labour than child-bearing. Very little employment can for a season be pursued besides the care of the offspring, this alone will be sufficient to engage her principal concern, and before one infant can be confided to himself another may reasonably be supposed approaching; thus is incumbrance likely to succeed on incumbrance, a second to arrive before the first can be removed, and such is the circle of her occupation probably for a

revolution of many years, or the better part of life. It is true, this is not always the case, but is constantly to be expected, and very often happens, on which supposition the wife and all the helpless issue must for the most part depend upon the man's endeavours for subsistence. As nothing can be more apparent than the necessity of multiplying offspring in consequence of mortality to recruit its depredations, so nothing can be more conspicuous than the truth of the other effects thereupon suggested, viz. that the woman was principally devoted to pregnancy and this essential increase of issue, and the man was at the same time driven to toil for their support and maintenance. What can be more profound and just than the different department which the account represents each sex ordained to upon this event in the creation? The only circumstance that is commonly observed as productive of labour is the establishment of barrenness upon the ground, which of itself could have no more

more affected or concerned the man than woman. But the history is much more significant and expressive in addressing the matter as it does particularly to the former, an extraordinary degree of toil being as remarkably entailed on him as there is of sorrow in child-bearing on the latter.

Indeed this institution of labour upon man is by far the most singular and eccentric law in nature; for other creatures undergo some pain in bringing forth, tho' not so great as women; but there is not an instance in the visible creation, except among mankind, where the charge of supporting the female both in gestation and nurture of the offspring devolves almost entirely on the male. Among quadrupeds the former maintains herself and young without any assistance from the latter either before or after the production; and tho' this holds not among birds, yet the female contributes at least as much toward the charge of propagation and nurture

as the male. She is altogether as instrumental in the formation of the nest, and not only lays the eggs entirely but sits on them alternately, and in that case supplies herself with food; nor after the young are produced does she contribute less than an equal proportion toward their maintenance. Thus is it evident that the circumstances related in the Mosaic account of the man and woman are by no means ordinary or indifferent matters that may easily be said at random, but very peculiar properties whereby the province of each is not only distinguished from that of the other, but also from that of the same sex in every different species whatsoever; the difficulties of gestation and nurture not being such among any creatures except them, but that the female may either support herself and both these exigencies alone, or at least, besides sustaining herself at all times, contribute one half of the provision toward the offspring.

The

The peculiar establishment of toil on man has now been amply manifested, the full enlargement of his obligation however has not been represented yet; another considerable branch of labour remains in the exigency of cloathing, which forms a very material article of life, and occupies no small part of human concern. Nothing can be more obvious from the Mosaic account than that this existed not before but was introduced upon the fall; since however the opinion seems invalidated, or at least obscured by a metaphorical interpretation of the passage contended for by some expositors, it is incumbent upon me to pay some notice and attention to it.

“ They who take the word *naked* in
 “ a literal sense, says Mr. Stackhouse,
 “ [History of the Bible, vol. 1, page 42.]
 “ suppose that upon the fall, the air and
 “ other elements immediately became in-
 “ temperate and disorderly; so that our
 “ parents knew or felt that they were
 “ naked,

“ naked, because the sun scorched them,
 “ the rain wet them, and the cold pierced
 “ them.

“ But others take the expression in a
 “ figurative sense, viz. to denote the
 “ commission of such sins as a man in his
 “ senses may be well ashamed of; and
 “ to this purpose they have observed, that
 “ when Moses returned from the mount,
 “ and found that the people had made
 “ and consecrated a golden image, the
 “ expression in Scripture is that they
 “ were naked, that is, were become vile
 “ and reprobate sinners; (for so the word
 “ γυμνός signifies in the New Testament,
 “ Rev. xvi. ~~verse~~ 15) for Aaron had made
 “ them naked unto their shame among
 “ their enemies. Exod. xxxii, verse 25.
 “ [Vide Le Clerc’s Commentary.] Now
 “ those who take it in this sense have
 “ observed further, that by the word
 “ nakedness, according to the usual mo-
 “ desty of the Hebrew tongue, are meant
 “ all irregular appetites to venereal plea-
 “ sures,

“ fures, which Adam and Eve were stran-
 “ gers to in their state of innocence, but
 “ now began first to experience, and
 “ which the intoxicating juice of the
 “ forbidden fruit might very probably ex-
 “ cite.” [Nicholl's Conference, vol 1.]

In answer to this I shall not enter into a discussion of the texts produced to confirm the figurative construction, but shall only survey the passage in dispute, the least consideration of which will be sufficient to shew how contradictory and incongruous as well as far-fetched and distant the interpretation is. For it is said of our first parents *before* the fall that they were naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed; how then can the word in question signify that they were vile and reprobate sinners addicted to irregular lusts and passions? Nothing can be a more direct repugnancy than the methaphorical exposition is to itself which supposes these qualities to have commenced upon the violation of
 the

the tree of knowledge, and in the same breath ascribes them to mankind before it happened. It is strange that any should be capable of thus forgetting themselves; the only question that can be made is not concerning the literal sense of nakedness, but the *ground* of the alteration felt, whereupon our first parents became so solicitous in pursuit of cloathing, when they had previously been so indifferent with regard to it, and found no manner of inconvenience from the want of it. This is in some measure liable to be mistaken, I shall therefore enter into a further illustration of the passage.

It must be confessed then that the history seems to denote a consciousness of shame to have been the occasion of this new demand of covering; which sensation man was unacquainted with in uprightness, but wretchedly experienced after his transgression; as appears from the cause assigned for his unwillingness to attend the summons of his Maker. I
was

was ashamed, says Adam, because I was naked, and therefore I hid myself; accordingly many have entertained a notion that an instinct of this nature was entailed upon the species at the fall in consequence of the irregular affections which then broke loose upon them; which probably was the principal meaning of the late quotation, tho' it so unfortunately deduces this from the signification itself of naked.

Bishop Beveridge with much more plausibility and consistency observes, "That
 "before they were so perfectly innocent
 "and free from all irregular motions that
 "they had nothing to be ashamed of;
 "but now the case was altered, for they
 "found themselves naked and divested
 "of their former innocence; so were
 "ashamed of themselves and what they
 "had done, and endeavoured to hide it
 "as well as they were able." [Vol. 5, page 148.]

This is the superficial, but by no means the real suggestion of the history, and my reason for the opinion is, that what Adam pleads was not the real motive of his flight; consequently what Moses says in reference to this excuse, is not to be understood in a literal sense but as bearing an ironical allusion to it. Adam, as it is natural for a person conscious of guilt, prevaricates and prefers any miserable subterfuge before the truth; upon which the Supreme Being asks him, whether there were not a more substantial ground of apprehension at bottom than he thought proper to assign; who told thee that thou wast naked? Hast thou eaten of the tree whereof I commanded thee, that thou shouldest not eat? I am disposed to think then what Moses says of his condition in innocence an irony on his wretched evasion now, not only because it furnished so just an occasion for one, but on account of what is said in chap. iii, ver. 7; and the eyes of them both were opened,

opened, and they saw that they were naked, and they sewed fig-leaves.

Now the former part of this is evidently a reflection on what the serpent said of the forbidden fruit, that on the day they eat thereof their eyes should be opened; upon which the author observes that their eyes were opened indeed, but in a very different manner (as all allow) from what had been proposed and promised; and there is the utmost reason to imagine that what he says of their perceiving that they were naked is also to be interpreted in the same kind of strain from its having been a meer pretence and affording an equal occasion for irony, as well as being immediately joined in the same sentence with one. The connection seems to imply that as their eyes were opened, tho' to a very different purpose from what they expected, so did they truly find that they were naked but on quite another account from what they insinuated, i. e. they could no lon-

ger bear the inclemency of air and elements that now began to injure and annoy them. This appears a much more solid and substantial ground for the concern of our first parents with respect to cloathing, as was the violation of the forbidden fruit for their endeavouring to conceal themselves.

There certainly was some occasion for the new contrivance of theirs with fig-leaves; thus much is evident from what Moses mentions, and the provision that God was afterward pleased to ordain them in the skins of beasts; they as indisputably experienced the effects of nakedness as that their eyes were opened; but there is no more reason to conclude the original of this was shame than that the concomitant circumstance is to be understood according to what had been suggested by the serpent; there is in every respect equal room and necessity for supposition of irony on each pretence.

On

On the other hand, nothing is more likely than for the ground alledged to have been the true foundation of the want sustained, there being the utmost reason to suppose that external nature as well as man underwent at the fall a fundamental change. We commonly read the circumstances of this great event with too much indifference and levity of attention, it being in all probability the occasion of a new establishment to the whole terraqueous globe; as appears from the decree of barrenness upon the soil, a matter that requires nothing less than a new modification and arrangement of the world in general. Amidst this universal shock of alteration then we can hardly suppose the elements to have been unconcerned; particularly when we consider their almost insupportable severity to the defenceless frame of man at present, it becomes in this view highly probable that there was some very extraordinary change in one or both of them. Perhaps the former were neither so fierce and boisterous, nor was the latter

latter so infirm and feeble ; the immortality of the species itself denotes an adamantine frame suitable to the duration it was ordained to undergo ; a constitution the reverse of what must be peculiar to a short state of sickness and disease that is every moment tending to a speedy dissolution. In short, there must have been, by some means or other, a very material difference in the original relation between this earthly tabernacle and the elements ; for Adam could want nothing in Paradise conducive to his satisfaction, to which nothing is more expedient now than cloathing for protection. I know, it has been supposed by some that this is utterly useless and superfluous, from the example of the Americans who are said to have been found at first without any such appendage ; but the exception, if it be true, is no more an objection to exigency of the thing than it is to the notion of a Deity that many tribes have been discovered without any such idea. It is commonly urged that there is a Supreme Being from the prevailing tradition
and

and consent concerning him, the instances that may be afforded to the contrary being looked upon as very insufficient to counteract so general a persuasion of mankind; in like manner it may be said of cloathing that its suitableness to the human frame has had the concurrent agreement of almost all communities, however different or distant from each other, and whether they were civilized or barbarous. The few exceptions that are found are always mentioned as the most extraordinary instances, and indeed demonstrate that covering is not absolutely essential to the constitution of man in every climate, but no way prove that it is not requisite and meet, or that it does not tend to the comfort and improvement of human life. If they did, we must infer the like against the use of metals, animals, arts, sciences, and civil government, in most of which particulars the Americans were as defective as they were in cloathing. The want of these advantages only serves to shew in how very rude and barbarous a state mankind are capable of existing. On

On the contrary it is very beautifully observed by philosophers in the present purpose, that other animals have the natural tegument of shells, hides, prickles, shag, bristles, down, quills, scales, fleeces, or the like, man only, tho' he exceeds them all in tendernefs, has nothing without his own manufacture fimilar to any of these provisions: the reason of which is (as they juftly urge) to ftir up and excite his induftry, Providence has fupplied him with proper art and instruments for his own fupply, and very wifely constrained him, (as will foon become apparent) to the exercife and employment of them.

If then we fuppofe the utility of cloaths from hoftility of elements commencing at the fall, the fame conclufion follows in great meafure with regard to houfes; there could not be much occafion for thefe when the former were of no fignificancy or fatisfaction; the fecurity of fpontaneous trees or eafily connected harbours muft have been as effectual for
extraordinary

extraordinary shelter and protection then as stone walls of the most laborious structure can be now. But not to pursue conjecture (tho' founded on probability) too far, here let us rest between the past and present world, in order to behold the vast diversity between them.

From the signatures we have recorded of the former, the universal system of this terrestrial globe must have been essentially rent and broken from its first foundation; nature as well as man appears a shattered ruin; the one being reduced from fruitfulness and bright serenity to barrenness and clashing elements, the other bent down from a far nobler sphere to the low cares of self-defence and meer subsistence.

Of all creatures whatsoever he labours under the most numerous wants and exigencies; the liberal bounty of the Creator without exception furnishes others with a supply of cloathing, like lilies they neither

toil nor spin, and yet it may with equal propriety be said, that Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of them.

The same may be observed for the most part with respect to houses; these are either not required or spontaneously provided for inferior animals; and for food they neither sow nor cultivate, nor in the main are obliged to use any other pains besides those of gathering; it rises in perfection for their use, while man is not only obliged to employ great art and industry to procure, but afterward to prepare the same for sustenance.

This disparity between him and other creatures is frequently observed by Naturalists, and by the Scripture ascribed in its original to the fall; for tho' in his innocence he is said to have been put into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it, yet his employment must have been of a widely different nature then from what it is at present, and ordained
for

for amusement only instead of a task or toil. When we consider in one collective view the earth bringing forth her fruits spontaneously, at least without being rent or tormented violently, the woman free both from disability and frequency of child-bearing, with the other immunity of the species from the necessity of cloaths, and probably of houses; we cannot but conclude the requisite employment which is now a matter of so much extraordinary toil to have then been nothing more than the means of recreation and delight. In short, if great things may be compared with small, the one bears such analogy to the other as the exercise of a person of elegance and affluence indulging himself at ease in beautifying plantations, woods, and gardens does to the slavery of a drudge obliged to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow in the stubborn tillage of a barren farm.

But from the alteration itself let us now proceed to examine its design and

VOL. II.

R r 2

motive;

motive; and here we shall find that
 immense as the difference is, it was
 not ordained without sufficient cause; for
 while nature remained free from tendency
 to depravity, there was no necessity for
 any extraordinary means to counteract
 the voluntary movement of it. The dis-
 position of man might be entrusted to
 its own operation then, when its byas
 inclined toward perfection; which could
 no longer be permitted after it became
 incumbered with so preponderating a
 principle of corruption. It is essential now
 for the species to be employed, if only
 to be preserved from evil; idleness is the
 chief parent at least nurse of wickedness,
 and if mankind could afford to live in
 it, they are utterly unfit to bear it, of
 which the great are melancholy witnesses
 and examples. Who more debauched
 and sensual, what persons more addicted
 to impurity, profaneness, pride and pro-
 fligacy; or to break down social obliga-
 tions, and trample under foot all order,
 law and decency, than they who roll in
 affluence,

affluence, are become a prey to idleness, and have no necessity of any innocent occupation to subdue their lusts and passions? Idleness and plenty have the most corrupting influence even on the best of minds; if any means will convert men into swine, these are sufficient; most graciously and wisely therefore did the Sovereign Providence ordain that, when nature had departed from its purity and perfection, men should be employed in general, and whatever might be the lot of some, there should be but few possessed of such dangerous incentives against the peace and welfare of society. Bad as the race are at present, they would have been manifoldly worse without this; labour performs the part both of a rod and bridle, to correct the force of corrupt affections and restrain men from the precipitancy of them.

B O O K III.

CHAPTER III.

ON THE SUBJECTION OF THE WOMAN.

MY next step will be more fully to manifest the subordination of the woman, toward which there has already been some progress made in the proof of her insufficiency for labour and consequent dependance, so far as the obligation of this extends, for subsistence on the man. I now proceed to consider how she is disabled by the same means of pregnancy for every species of employment except that which is called domestic, as well as mechanical and manual drudgery. Toil is not an incident confined to those of low and mean condition, but inseparably entailed on all of any service in society; it is the portion of every useful class in the community in such degree as is either
utterly

utterly irreconcilable or at least comparatively very unfuitable to the state of child-bearing and designation of women in the creation. A variety of ends will at once be answered by this discussion, the veracity and justness of the Mosaic will be more apparent still from the universality of this institution upon man, both as to the thing itself and as it tends to create a co-extensive effect of subordination upon woman; but what I chiefly propose to shew thereby is the inequality of the latter in mind as well as body, which will fully prepare the way toward the subjection mentioned; every circumstance that is necessary to compleat the obligation of it, both in a natural and moral sense, being by these means accomplished. I hope I am not guilty of any rudeness in this attempt; I mean not to disparage the fair sex, but to illustrate and confirm the Scripture, the truth of which is too sacred to be given up to complaisance, or sacrificed to any pretended notions of politeness; besides

besides which the proposition is in great measure stripped of its obnoxiousness by considering that the inequality contended for is not occasioned by any "original inferiority of the mind, but entirely by the same incumbrance of the body as hinders them from extraordinary avocations and employments.

That child-bearing with its appurtenance of nurture then is a perpetual bar to all other engagements of consequence in life, that these require labour of body or assiduity of mind which women in that state are very unequal to when compared with men (if capable of at all) we need only an enumeration of human concerns to be convinced. Agriculture, commerce, medicine, administration of public affairs (whether military, maritime, or civil) are liable to such exercise of body or application of mind, and so frequently require the utmost exertions that can be made of both, that none who are affected with any peculiar disabilities

bilities can properly be ordained to them. Business of every kind almost is subject to a variety of distant calls, and where the scene of it is most contracted, must be pursued without intermission; it is therefore particularly unsuitable to those who must contend with the difficulties of child-bearing, which renders them unfit for any but domestic occupations and for a considerable time incapable of paying much regard to these. It is a meer notion then that females are excluded from offices of state, professions and the great abundance of callings that are necessary to the support of life by custom and prescription only; they are not more debarred by these than by the original law and constitution of their nature, where the foundation of the restraint is laid. Even those employments that appear most light and suitable to their condition, we find are in great measure fulfilled by men, however it may be regretted, on account of the manifold interruptions incident to women in their

married state. How much more then must they be debarred from correspondence with the great and various concerns of life? And what can be a plainer consequence than that being thus excluded from the fundamental transactions of the world, they cannot be by nature qualified for the attainment of equal understanding in these? Experience and observation are the necessary means of human knowledge, the grounds of which are not books but men and their affairs; from extensive commerce with which the fair sex being particularly restrained, must be proportionably circumscribed as to judgment and comprehension of them.

Some persons observing women as quick and clear in their capacity as men, are ready to exclaim, Why might they not attain the same proficiency in knowledge, if they were educated in the same manner? But this is a question that could proceed only from inattention to the proper objects it consists of, and materials
it

it is founded on. It may as well be asked, Why might they not become as compleat Admirals and Generals as men? The reason is that they must be seamen and soldiers first, which would not be very suitable to their other offices in life; if there ever were any such nation as the Amazons, it is very rightly related that they permitted not men among them but at certain times and under very particular restrictions; the proper state of nature and commerce with the male sex would have soon destroyed their military prowess, and was more necessary to be cut off than their right breast.

The same is applicable to every other profession as well as that of arms, tho' it may not be liable to such personal danger; the civil departments of life are occasionally subject to as great fatigue as those of the ocean or the field, and women may as well be commanders by sea and land as statesmen, lawyers, physicians or the like; the business that

must be performed by all persons of real use and importance in these stations being abundantly more than they can go thro', while they fulfil their appointed province in the creation; consequently being debarred from practice, they are from science in all such weighty matters.

Nor is this the whole, for men not only derive a greater degree of knowledge from that of experience and observation, but also a sounder habit of judgment and reflection. Exercise improves the strength of the body, so does application that of the mind; and as from confinement to domestic scenes arises tenderness of constitution, so does a suitable inferiority of understanding follow from less enlarged and strenuous application of intellectual powers. The more arduous concerns of business being peculiar objects of attention to the men, a stronger frame of mind must needs ensue from the more vigorous attention requisite than can be expected to proceed from the subordinate,

subordinate, superficial and contracted matters of female occupation.

This I assert notwithstanding the great number and excellence of female writers who have of late abounded, which the celebrated Countess de Genglis sets forth on the opposite side of the question. She says, "That women in this age have
 "written with the greatest success in every
 "branch of literature; the best modern
 "novels are their productions, nor have
 "they been less distinguished in Poetry;
 "Cantatas and Tragedies have been written
 "by them. In Russia a woman directs
 "the labours of a celebrated academy
 "of which she is perpetual president,
 "and there are many ladies to be met
 "with who know English, Italian, Spanish,
 "and even Latin." [Tales of the Castle,
 vol. 5, pages 42, &c.]

But all this they may do, and not have the balance of knowledge on their side, or any possibility by nature of equal

equal pretensions to it ; the great branches of this consisting not in what may be learned at school or in the closet, or in the composition of words and sentences, but in what must be obtained by acquaintance with the world at large, and the fundamental affairs of life ; which women can never have equal opportunity of understanding while they fulfil the more proper duties of their station.

There is another passage of this ingenious lady I cannot abstain from quoting vol. iv, pages 62, &c. " All men are
 " ready to allow we play on instruments,
 " we dance, and even talk as well as they,
 " because these are facts that cannot be
 " denied. There exists another talent
 " however equally common to women as
 " to men ; and this enchanting and sublime
 " art necessarily demands fine and lively
 " feelings, energy, enthusiasm, and all the
 " emotions of the mind, which according
 " to them belong only to the men." This
 she says is the art of an actress and adds,
 " Had

“ Had all the other arts as well as this,
 “ been less the fruits of education and
 “ study than the happy gift of nature,
 “ there is no doubt but there would have
 “ existed a perfect equality between men
 “ and women.”

Here again we may not only admit the facts, but in some measure the reasoning, and yet deny the consequence; if it be meant that mental incapacity is not the occasion of any inequality between men and women, I very freely pay this tribute to the latter, in matters of much greater consequence than acting, music, painting, or the like, which she lays so much stress upon. But if it be implied that the disparity between them proceeds from an arbitrary and groundless difference of education, as is evidently the case, here I beg leave to dissent for the reasons above-mentioned. This is the common error, that the inequality of understanding is originally seated in the mind or not in nature; the old-fashioned account of
 Moses

Moses is the only just one I have met with, others either questioning the effect or if convinced of this ascribing it to a wrong cause, and nothing being more remote from their imagination than that what produces bodily should be the occasion likewise of mental inferiority, tho' so plainly hinted in the subordination mentioned at the fall.

It cannot be denied, I think, that the subjection of woman is naturally compleated by this inferiority of knowledge as well as strength with dependance for support and management of the great affairs of life, whatever objections may be urged from individuals or the prevailing influence of the fair sex in the world. While they were committed to the government of men, they were not made vessels for oppression, but favourites for protection who frequently over-rule their lords and masters. Another thing I would observe to alleviate the general subjection is, that thro' the wisdom and goodness of the

Creator

Creator there is a moral obligation included in the natural, inferiority of mind and body being made the joint effect of one common cause, and thereby the subordination mentioned not more inevitable than reasonable in nature.

As then we have shewn that subjection was established in the best as well as most effectual manner, let us now proceed to explain the Reason of its being ordained at all; and this is easy to be deduced from the present state of nature, which, without some subordination, would scarce be capable of existing. Were every one possessed of the same power, what would prevail but strife and contention throughout the world? Men in order to their end must act concurrently, each individual can never pursue his own good so effectually as in society and conjunction; but were an entire equality to have place among the species, what common interest or order would ever be duly observed and followed? The general ad-

vantage may to the superficial seem sufficient to recommend itself, but it is by fatal experience found that each person chiefly labours for his own separate interest or inclination, and that nothing would ensue from so indiscriminate a constitution but universal disorder and confusion. The will of every one would in the event prove that of no one, as is sensibly felt where there is no person to direct and govern; if inequality were not ordained it would continually be contended for, and men are so well satisfied of this in common that where there is not a natural superiority there is frequently an artificial one created; whence the distinctions of rank and forms of precedence in society, which are at all times found to be more or less expedient. Authority and jurisdiction, however they may vary, must have their being; tho' the powers that are must be always liable to err, and may be often guilty of offending, yet the inconvenience of this is no way to be compared with the disorder of

of

of perpetual strife and opposition, nor is any tyranny so deplorable as that of anarchy and the multitude.

Thus much of the exigency of inequality in general, whence we may collect its usefulness in the present instance between man and woman in particular; every society (whether great or small) requiring a head to direct and regulate its operations, without which the several members could not long be kept in any kind of harmony or order. If then the original of government be asked, I answer that it is much more ancient than is commonly imagined and that the foundation thereof was laid in the distinction instituted upon the fall between the only pair which then subsisted, and it was capable of being ordained between. It could not be patriarchal but only conjugal at first, in the inequality however appointed between the sexes was fixed the principle and pattern of every other species of subordination, (as in private families are

laid the seeds of commonwealths and kingdoms) and this must have been, as Moses says, not only of Divine establishment but also strictly coeval with our present nature.

While mankind enjoyed their original integrity, government was altogether superfluous and unnecessary; for their Reason being perfect for their station, and their passions (instead of disturbing) acting in entire concurrence with it, individuals would have been hereby as unerringly directed toward their proper ends as inferior animals are by their instincts. This glorious constitution being however broken, and folly with ignorance and forwardness brought into nature, subjection became expedient to keep the corrupted body of mankind in union; dominion and power are now the only means of holding the disordered parts and members of society together. The Scripture amply testifies its wisdom in declaring, that tho' there were only two in being at the fall, equality could

could be no longer suffered, but the contrary became that instant requisite to be ordained between them. What an idea are we at the same time presented with of the innocence and perfection of the species, when each person as a social creature required no superior light to guide or power to confine his footsteps within the paths of rectitude? When Reason stood in need of no prescription, and conscience might have been trusted solely for its own obligation, the one shining like the sun in unclouded brightness beyond capacity of improvement from any borrowed aid, and the other being as much more cogent of itself than all the fetters that have ever since been made to bind it. Let us, as the matter stands however, adore and magnify the wisdom of our great Creator, in that he has favoured us with the present support of society and cement of connection; not esteeming subjection (as has been too commonly done) a curse and punishment, but one of the greatest blessings
the

the condition of man was capable of receiving; without which perhaps every other might have proved insufficient to preserve the species.

B O O K III.

CHAPTER IV.

ON PAIN.

THE next introduction I purpose to discuss is that of pain or sorrow, which we not only find particularly announced to the woman in travail, but to both the sexes in common throughout the course of life. The use and end of the former has been shewn in that it contributes to the subjection of the person affected by it, and indeed the final cause of natural evil at large has been very sufficiently explained in the preceeding book, where
it

it was proved the means of our future security in Heaven. It shall be my business now however to consider the necessity of it, as I have done that of the other changes to the present life; and we shall find that even here, however frightful a specter pain may superficially appear, it is not an evil in itself, but only the inseparable consequence and companion of one. So far is it from a detriment in its own nature, that on the contrary it serves as a faithful centinel against what is such; viz. to admonish us of a present injury, oblige us to seek relief in season from it, and for the future guard against the most distant means of its approach. This cannot be illustrated by a better example than that produced by Mr. Locke upon the occasion. An extremity of heat or cold being equally pernicious to the constitution by an excess or defect of motion in the blood that follows from it; he observes that pain is accordingly annexed to each, whereby we are driven as with an instant rod from the dangerous
cause

cause of harm in both. Again, an overflow of light being highly detrimental to the organs of the sight, is therefore constantly attended with displeasure to them, which compels us immediately to shelter them from the obnoxious circumstance; but as to the opposite extreme of darkness, the effect is altered in suitable conformity to the reason of the thing; for the greatest depth of this, not being injurious to the eyes, is ordained not to be in the least offensive to them. Thus tho' in sickness we consider pain as the only evil that we labour under, and are prone to suppose it is this which subdues mankind, and is impossible in extremity to be endured; yet is it apparent that we here, as in many other instances, mistake the consequence for the cause; where a previous detriment exists, there only anguish being felt; and unless the former invades, the latter never coming near us. That danger is commonly the greatest, the approach of which is not declared by pain; but of every other
that

that without exception the most deplorable when the person is past sense of feeling it, the mortification is then struck deep beyond recovery. The first is as a fire commencing in the night when men are in the depth of sleep, the last is like the same advanced to such a height that there is no possibility of extinguishing or escaping it; in the one case some fortunate event may happen to warn them of their impending ruin so as to provide for their security in season, but in the other instance of the disease as well as of the flames the matter is far gone beyond Redemption, and should they be awaked it can be only to perceive the inevitableness of their destruction. In mortifications therefore the admonition of pain like that of conscience cases, when it would be no further service or advantage, and the door of grace is shut against all possibility of recovery.

Thus much of disorder without the advertisement of pain or when the patient is past sense of feeling it, whence instead of the all-conquering scorpion and destroyer it appears under God the great guardian and preserver of the human frame and faculties; ordained to supply the want of Reason, where we should not be suspicious of harm or be too late in our discoveries, and to enforce an industry for the maintenance of those blessings Heaven has committed to us, where meer speculation probably would leave us too supine and negligent. Whoever consults the present disposition of our nature will be convinced that the detriment of a thing in distant consequence has very little force or influence in comparison with a quick sensation of uneasiness; were it not for this men would be as indifferent about their daily food as exercise or devotion; the benefits of life and limb would be often as scandalously thrown away as oaths of the most awful nature are for want of a more immediate penalty to attend upon
 such

such profusion. In such situation and exigency stand the present race; our first parents, however, possessed in Paradise a far more sublime and exalted nature; *their* Reason was neither so contracted in its sphere, slow in its operation, nor infirm and feeble in its authority; it neither wanted information in sufficient season of what was meet and proper for their being, nor a perpetual rod and spur, as ours, to compel the observation of it; these only became expedient after they had reduced themselves to this inferior state of being.

The original faculty in Adam of discerning things without experience by immediate intuition may like every other quality that pain supplies the place of be very clearly collected from its non-existence before the fall. I cannot, however, omit a very brilliant observation to the same effect drawn from his appointing to animals he never before had seen, names that were perfectly adapted to their natures, which no philosopher ever yet at-

tempted; and from his declaring the origin and end of woman the first instant of his meeting with her. It is very well suggested by Mr. Stackhouse on the latter, that from her similitude to himself he might have conjectured indeed that God had provided him a meet help which before he wanted; but it is scarce possible to conceive how he should so punctually describe her rise and manner of formation, and so surely prophecy that the general event to his posterity would be for the sake of her to leave father and mother, and cleave to their wife otherwise than by divine illumination; which enabled him to view essences in themselves, and read forms without the comment of their respective properties; to see consequences yet dormant in their principles, and effects yet unborn in the womb of their causes; in short, to pierce almost into future contingencies, and improve conjectures even to a prophecy, and the certainties of a prediction. [See Stackhouse's History of the Bible, vol. 1, page 35, and South's Sermons, vol. 1.] To

To return to the consideration of pain, let what has been said suffice as to its natural use and exigency; but this however great, is trifling in comparison with its moral and religious excellency. Before the fall there were no such qualities as presumption, arrogance, and pride* which at present manifoldly abound and for which affliction is the only cure. Why need I name intemperance, profligacy and profaneness? What innumerable enormities that never before existed must have been
 now

*It may be deemed perhaps an extraordinary assertion, that there were no such qualities as the above-mentioned before the fall, when these seem to have been the occasion of the event, and it was the woman's aspiring after nothing less than Godhead which engaged her to commit the offence against the forbidden fruit. But the answer to this objection, however formidable it may appear, is obvious; for a vice may be very possible that is by no means natural, essentially inherent excellence is the prerogative of God alone, even the highest of archangels may incidentally depart and that in the utmost degree from rectitude. To which when we add the extraordinary temptation that mankind were for the wisest reasons suffered to undergo from a much superior enemy, this removes at once all objection from their fall or the notion of its happening so soon.

now without this salutary scourge beyond a remedy? How many reprobates, that would otherwise have been irrecoverably lost in sensuality, have been hereby reclaimed and snatched like fire-brands out of the flames? Multitudes of persons, who from succeeding constantly in their desires have learned to despise all fellow creatures and exalt themselves above the God that made them, have by this disciplining rod of Providence been taught a juster sense of their obligations and reduced to humble themselves in dust before him. Indeed there is scarce a vice that continued prosperity does not now beget, and that the furnace of affliction does not contribute to cleanse men from the pollution of; it is an universal purifier from uncleanness, as well as parent and promoter of every christian grace and virtue. Humility, peaceableness, and modesty; humanity, chastity, and temperance; patience, meekness, and resignation, are all taught by this spiritual preceptor; it not only controuls the
vicious

vicious in their career of wickedness, but variously promotes the virtuous in their course of righteousness; if ever men are disposed to seek after God, or do it with more than ordinary importunity, it is in the day of sorrow and affliction surely. In short pain is the grand instrument whereby Providence supports the government of the present world, and prepares men for the better that is to come; it is that which chiefly teaches us the difference between good and evil, and whereby we are exercised and trained for Heaven.

Had man retained the image of his Maker, there would have been no occasion either to correct his inclinations, or to draw them off from the seat of his habitation; the one being pure and perfect in themselves, the other as suitably accommodated for their everlasting reward and satisfaction. At present however besides the necessity of a curb on our evil inclinations, the world being not designed for our perpetual mansion, it is by no means

means meet that we should settle our desires upon it; if we do, we shall not only be disappointed of our wishes, but what is infinitely worse, forego our better end. How prone men are notwithstanding to this there certainly can be required no testimony or proof to manifest; with what beneficence and wisdom then has Providence embittered the road of this life, wherein we are too fond of loitering, with so many contradictions and crosses to our affections in order to wean them from it, and fix them on their proper object? When men have been made truly sensible of the vanity and emptiness of the present state, even in its best enjoyments, and have smarted from the many spears and arrows with which they are so obnoxious to be wounded in it, then are they, if ever, effectually disposed to seek for Heaven; it is thus that the Prophets, Apostles, and Primitive Christians were prepared, and by such means I believe that most who obtain Salvation are promoted

moted to it, whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth.

Before I quit this subject I cannot omit a very extraordinary conclusion drawn by a celebrated Socinian from the introduction of pain, viz. that man was more prone to sin before than he has been since the institution of it.—“ That mankind are
 “ considerable sufferers in consequence of
 “ the fall, he says, is not denied; but all
 “ the evils that Moses specifies as affecting his posterity are of a corporeal nature, viz. labour, sorrow, and death.
 “ It is possible indeed that the body being
 “ more subject to disease, the mind may
 “ be more feeble and therefore more subject to comply with some temptations;
 “ but then it should be considered that
 “ a sickly constitution is more favourable
 “ to many virtues, and we see that a state
 “ of confirmed health is often highly dangerous in a moral respect; so that upon the whole it is probable that our
 Vol. II. X x “ condition

“condition is more favourable to virtue than that of Adam.” [See a Treatise stiled, A Familiar Illustration of certain Passages of Scripture, by a Lover of the Gospel; page 11. The same too, if I misremember not, is intimated by Dr. Foster, in his sermon on the Image of God in Man; or the Excellency of Human Nature.]

If it be assumed for granted that nature was in each situation subject to the same propensity to sin, it follows, indeed, that our condition, instead of being more corrupt, is more favourable to virtue now than it was before the fall. But there is no necessity for this presumption, tho’ Moses says not any thing expressly of the difference in our spiritual estate; the present establishment of sorrow and its non-appointment in the beginning form a sufficient proof that the imperfection which now so loudly calls for it was not then in being. What more natural than to conclude the commencement of moral infirmity and disorder from the introduction

duction of regimen and medicine? But to infer that mankind are in a purer state under the confinement and prescription of these than they were before the application of such remedies was needful is one of the strangest and most preposterous methods of reasoning I ever heard of. There is no possibility of evading this without a very desperate remedy, viz. by impeaching the Divine wisdom and affirming that the necessity of pain was the same before as after the fall, but not apparent to the Creator, of which he was soon made sensible by the consequence, and obliged by experience to amend his workmanship. Such a suggestion, however, is what I will not suppose a lover of the Gospel capable of, nor if he were would it any way avail him; for it would not be a greater reflection upon the first than final state of man, or reproach to Paradise than Heaven; from the latter of which all sorrow is confessedly excluded, and it will not be pretended, I presume, that the constitution of it will be less favourable to virtue than that of the present world.

B O O K III.

CHAPTER V.

ON DEATH AND OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES RELATING TO THE INSTITUTION OF IT.

WE are now arrived at the last appointment death, the chief remedy of all our evils, and indeed the only one that many of them are capable of; there the wicked cease from troubling, there the weary are at rest. Immortality can be a blessing only where there is a suitable foundation laid for its enjoyment, which was originally the case since if mankind had remained in innocence rectitude would have been universal, and without any alloy of vice, infirmity, or ignorance; so that nothing would have appeared like injury or wrong to require either punishment or redress. Suitable to the moral world would have been the natural world, free from sickness, sorrow, and uneasiness; whereby

whereby this establishment would have been like that which is to come, consummate in itself and such as required no alteration or amendment. Virtue would have had its compleat reward in the enjoyment of the perfect happiness which was entailed upon it, and vice would have not existed without violation of the forbidden fruit, which after the propagation of posterity was susceptible of a very easy remedy by the immediate destruction of the individuals only that offended. The law might have been duly executed on them, and thereby the harmony of the whole system kept entire, as if such transgression had never happened; all others who were born in uprightness instead of being any way involved in the consequence of their disobedience would have been effectually saved from it by their perdition. Such, I say, was the original constitution of mankind, for tho' God foresaw that the scheme would not continue, and had accordingly pre-ordained a better on the certain prospect of
of

of its fall; yet as it had the privilege of immortality annexed, it was so contrived that it might have remained for ever, there was no incongruity in the nature of the thing; since there was no impediment to compleat obedience or its everlasting happiness, which is widely different from our case at present. For what does this world of sin and sorrow, vanity and vexation furnish that the wise and virtuous can take much delight in even for the short time they may be allowed to continue in it? “Some few
 “years, says Dean Sherlock, give them
 “enough of it, tho’ they are not harrassed
 “with any great calamities, and there
 “are many miseries which nothing but
 “death can give relief to. This puts an
 “end to the sorrows of the poor, the
 “oppressed and the persecuted, it is a
 “haven of rest from all the troubles of
 “a tempestuous world, it strikes off the
 “prisoner’s shackles and dries up the tears
 “of the fatherless and widows, it tames
 “the proudest tyrants, and restores peace
 “to

“to the world; it puts an end to all our
 “labours and supports men under their
 “present adversities, especially when they
 “have a prospect of a better life after this.
 “The labour and misery of man under
 “the sun are very great, but they would
 “be intolerable if they were endless; there-
 “fore since sin entered into the world and
 “so many necessary calamities attend it, it is
 “an act of goodness as well as justice in
 “God to shorten this life and transplant
 “good men to a better.” [Discourse on
 Death, chap. ii. sec. 1, &c.]

Immortality is as repugnant to the moral
 constitution of the present world as death
 would be to that of Heaven, and would
 equally defeat every purpose for which this
 life was proper to be ordained; it would
 have perpetuated sin and evil (instead of
 accomplishing their extinction by a short
 experience of their bitterness and renova-
 tion to a more righteous state) would
 have left the virtuous without hope, the
 vicious without fear, and by cutting off
 all

all possibility of due rewards or punishments have banished every consideration that could render the condition of this world justifiable. For the removal of death would have been that of judgment, since (as the foregoing author well observes) there ever was and will be a mixture of good and bad men in the present state, nor can there be a suitable retribution of either, while they continue thus among each other. This world is not a proper scene of recompence in its own nature for the righteous, and if it were, would be disqualified by being made a place of final punishment for the wicked; because without a perpetual train of miracles the one cannot be separated from the other, and the bad cannot be greatly punished as they deserve but the good must share with them, which would render the earth an infernal region that both would be involved in. The tares cannot be rooted out in this case but the corn must be ruined with them, which shews that as after death there must be a judgement, so must it be appointed
unto

unto all men once to die; it is not more essential that there should be another state after this than it is that this should have an end, the exigency of the one not admitting of a completion without the expiration of the other. Indeed it would in many respects be far more tolerable were there no life after the present, than if this were to last for ever; for besides that sin and evil would be without redress or end, if men are so bad notwithstanding death, and when they know that they must answer so severely for their conduct afterward, how would it increase the strength of wickedness were there no period to be put to it? If besides their living without fear or danger of account perpetuity were likewise added to the growth of it? This would be much worse than the supposition of death without any future judgment, for the former puts a stop at least to the progress and prosperity of sinners, and is the means of removing those enormous scourges from the world for whom there is no other

relief or remedy. And if the evil under the sun have appeared so great (notwithstanding the shortness of our continuance here and the promise of a compleat redress) that some men have not scrupled to impeach the Divine Perfections, others been induced to doubt of them, and most been driven to such miserable shifts to reconcile them on its account ; what would have been the consequence had the present state been an endless, everlasting system ; especially with all the aggravation mentioned and when it would have been rendered so much more wicked than it is by this very circumstance of its duration ? Yet such is the folly and contradiction of unbelievers, that they who make the greatest objection against sin and evil, are commonly the loudest to exclaim against the introduction of death upon the fall ; when these must otherwise have been co-eternal with the constitution of our being, and death was equally essential with an universal Judgment, Retribution, or the kingdom of Heaven for their removal ;

moval; there being no possibility for either of the last-mentioned blessings to be fulfilled without it.

Nor can I omit, on this occasion, a great oversight of the Socinians, who acknowledge that mankind were considerable sufferers but will not allow that they were divested of innocence as well as immortality by the fall, or became subject to a state of depravity as well as death. For admitting that they now enjoy the image of their Maker as perfectly as they did before, and never were in a higher state of uprightness than they are, it is impossible they should be any sufferers by the fall; they must, on the contrary, be great gainers by it, in proportion to the exigency of death to our present constitution. I am happy however to concur with the author of the Appeal in one particular, viz. that our condition is in this case more favourable to virtue than was that of Adam; from what has been said it must be so according to the

supposition he lays down, for we need only to presume the same propensity to sin in Paradise as at present in order to demonstrate it the vilest condition of nature that can be imagined. Let us but consider what a state this world would be without any of those salutary restrictions that are laid on it to controul the evil dispositions of mankind, viz. without labour, sickness, subordination, or death, and we shall soon see how wretched a condition that of Adam must have been by means of so many original defects and blunders in the creation. Such omissions would have been the greatest curses instead of the institutions that have been called so, and nothing could be more necessary than for the state of Paradise to be altered soon; but nothing can be more self-repugnant at the same time than the supposition that man could fall from it, or in any shape be a sufferer by the present system.

As

As we depend then on the wisdom of the Supreme Being, who saw that every thing he made was good in the beginning, and wanted not experience to teach him what was essential to his works; so far may we be assured that there were no such fundamental errors in the creation, but that the depravity which now requires the regulations above-mentioned, existed not at first and was afterward the sole occasion of them. I assert this as much in opposition to those who ascribe death to the performance of the law, as to those who deny there was any such effect as the corruption of nature upon the fall; for as depravity is necessary to account for all the institutions that succeeded, so is it sufficient, consequently the imputation of any other cause is needless. Nor is it only this but false and detrimental to Redemption; there never was a juster rule in philosophy than that men are as much bound to reject all further cause than is sufficient as to receive whatever is requisite to explain phænomena; superabundance

perabundance in solution is one of the worst things that can be imagined, nor are those persons guilty of greater error who refuse what is necessary for this purpose than they who contend for more, and will have what is superfluous. For the consequence of insisting on this mortal state as the strict accomplishment of the law is that men have lost all sight of a Redemption, which has been rendered not only a mystery but contradiction by the means of it. Both cannot, as I said, consist together, either judgment or a release from it must be given up, and what more absurd than to contend for the literal execution of the former, where the latter is in every instance so conspicuous and so fully accounts for the non-performance of it. Yet men have been as ardent in resolving the present death into the rigid penalty of the law, as if there had never been any dispensation from it, or atonement made for the non-completion of it; when the establishment that ensued bore no relation to the penalty ordained

ordained but in appearance, and had in every respect a real tendency to the contrary purpose of Redemption. For the legal punishment would have been no less instant than eternal both according to the letter of the law and Reason of the thing; death would have been immediate for the same cause as final had not a remedy been provided, viz. in order to an entire suppression of the evil for which there was no redress. Perdition was ordained for this, not propagation of depravity for perdition; nor would God have any more decreed a previous respite than future recovery of man from death but in order to a restitution to his former state; the law would otherwise have been surely executed, as had been denounced, on the very day of the offence committed. The suspension of death alone to our first parents, whereby mankind were rescued from extinction, was a sufficient indication of a quite opposite purpose in their favour, nor can there be a more striking contradiction than between immediate destruction

tion the only circumstance to have been expected and a greater increase of offspring the first thing announced to the woman after her transgression. It was done indeed in a very different air and manner from that in which God blessed mankind at first (the reason whereof will be sufficiently explained hereafter) and there was seemingly a dismal train of events ordained at the same time, of which death brought up the rear; but besides that it was coupled with an express promise of a renovation, it was as well as each preceeding circumstance essential to this. There ensued not one alteration but what was necessary to the temporal or eternal welfare of mankind, either to the good of the present life or the establishment of a better; every modification of the former being suited to the disorder men had become subject to, and such as they could not have now subsisted in any tolerable degree without, much less have ever been confirmed in their original glory and perfection. But of all the circumstances
 leading

leading to this great event the last, that which is commonly considered the most grievous and repugnant, is in fact the most beneficial and conducive to it. The other ordinances of labour, sorrow, and subjection, are only partial remedies of depravity at present, may serve as lenitives to mitigate and restrain but cannot subvert and conquer it; death, on the contrary gives the finishing stroke to its removal, and crowns the work of its suppression; this is to the universal body of sin what excision is to a mortified and corrupted limb, the evil meant to be abolished is hereby utterly destroyed, and there is nothing now remaining to the righteous but renovation to eternal life and happiness.

Nor is this state only calculated by death for the extinction of depravity, but also admirably adapted by its successions to accomplish the number of the elect, which, as the world goes on, could not be done without a series of generations.

For in every age bad men abound, according to the operation of grace, tho' many are called but few chosen, and if this were not an exprefs declaration of our Saviour, it might easily be collected from the whole tenour of his doctrine. For what greater contradiction can there be than between the lives of men in general, and the rules and precepts of the Gospel? Whoever consider the depravity of the former, and the universal holiness required by the latter (as the indispensable condition without which no man shall be permitted to see the Lord) cannot but conclude that multitudes in every age must fail of obtaining eternal life; a suitable number of successions is therefore necessary to raise the complement of the blessed, without this the kingdom of Heaven cannot be fulfilled, but thereby must be accomplished in the end, however slowly it advances.

Thus is the present state instead of being any way calculated for original condemnation,

condemnation, in every respect adapted to the direct end of a Redemption; nothing can be more foreign or repugnant to the former, nothing more immediately conducive to the latter; and as the saying to the woman, thy desire shall be to thy husband and he shall rule over thee was not more expressive than the multiplicity and sorrow of child-bearing were executive of subjection, so the promise that her seed should bruise the serpent's head was not more declaratory of Redemption than all the circumstances of the fall were instrumental and preparatory to it. Indeed there was no other method of establishing mankind in future happiness than that pursued, viz. by duly moderating between the two extremes of eternal death and life upon the fall. Either of them would have been the ruin of the race, but the latter in our present circumstances far more grievous than the former; the only possibility of saving them was by ordaining this short and transcient state, which effectually serves

by the multitude of successions and experience of evil it affords, both to accomplish the number of the elect and to secure them from any future disobedience or death. This life and the consummation in whatever light we view them, whether a posteriori or priori, are inseparably connected; the former (as we have long shewn) would have been unjustifiable without the latter, and the latter (as we now demonstrated) impossible without the former; each is equally essential to the other, and a consummation not at all more necessary after the establishment of the present state, than this is an antecedent mean in order to it.

But tho' there is no doubt from so many concurrent circumstances that the mortality of mankind was entirely an institution for their deliverance, yet has it hitherto been considered as an effect of original condemnation only; nothing can have seemed more diametrically and directly opposite to what it is than this whole

whole conduct of Redemption, whence, as I observed, it is no wonder that it has appeared so great a mystery and contradiction. Men have been misguided as they were in the system of the universe by a false notion of phænomena, nor can the real be more contrary to the supposed motion in the Heavens, or the Zenith and Nadir to each other, than their opinion has been in this case to the right sense of things. They have commonly considered the most salutary medicines as the bitterest curses that could be imagined, and mistaken all the means of their deliverance for their damnation; so that it could scarce be deemed in the darkest ages more heretical or absurd to say that the Sun stands motionless in the Heavens, than it is at present to assert that the death which ensued upon the sin of Adam was not in any shape a judicial punishment. It is curious to observe what a variety of difficulties this inveterate prejudice has involved men in, and how these are all unravelled by the contrary account.

“ That

"That we suffer by the sin of Adam
 "(says a very sensible and ingenious
 "Calvinist) even the author of the Ap-
 "peal himself is obliged to allow. But
 "why should we suffer by it, if we had
 "no share, in any sense at all, in it?
 "Can we suppose a righteous God to
 "inflict sufferings upon any of his crea-
 "tures without a cause? Or if the sin
 "of Adam be the cause of any of the
 "sufferings inflicted on his descendants,
 "does not this imply that they are upon
 "some account or other considered as
 "partakers of his sin? Is it reasonable
 "to suppose that a righteous God involves
 "them in the penal effects of this sin
 "without their being at all concerned in
 "the sin itself, which yet is acknowledged
 "the cause of these effects? All that
 "is pleaded by those who maintain the
 "doctrine of original sin is that, as all
 "mankind suffer by the sin of Adam,
 "there must have been some original con-
 "stitution settled by God in consequence
 "of which it is right and just that they
 "should

" should so suffer. But that it should
 " be right for mankind to suffer *judicially*
 " by the sin of Adam, without at least
 " the imputation of that sin to them they
 " look upon as totally inconceivable. By
 " the imputation of Adam's sin however
 " they do not mean, that the great God
 " supposes the posterity of Adam to have
 " *actually* committed that sin which we
 " know is impossible; but that Adam who
 " was necessarily the natural root and head
 " of his posterity, was also for wise and
 " good reasons constituted their federal
 " or covenant head, and that therefore
 " the sin committed by him in that capaci-
 " ty, by which he broke the covenant
 " made with him, became chargeable
 " upon them." [See an Address to the
 Serious and Candid Professors of Christi-
 anity, occasioned by an Appeal, &c.]

That mankind should suffer *judicially*
 in consequence of Adam's sin without
 any imputation of it to them is utterly
 inconceivable, it certainly cannot be im-
 puted

puted to them more effectually than by involving them in such punishment, which occasioned the suggestion of his being their federal representative; a solution that is founded on a false notion, and no way reconciles the difficulty intended to be removed, but leaves it entirely where it was before. For it is altogether as easy to suppose with the Catholics that the posterity of Adam committed his sin before they were born, as that it could be right for them to suffer judicially by virtue of any such pretended representation: the Calvinists have made no improvement in this particular tho' what the author says in one place is very just, that we cannot suppose a righteous God to inflict sufferings upon any of his creatures without a cause, and if the sin of Adam be the cause of any inflicted on his descendants they must be on some account or other considered as partakers of his sin, there must have been some original constitution settled by God; in pursuance of which it is right and just that they should so suffer. All this is very true,

true, there was such a constitution settled, they are partakers of the effect and benefit of his sin thro' a Redemption, therefore may justly suffer by it; the natural evil of disobedience was entailed on his descendants for the best of causes, viz. their everlasting salvation from it; but the judicial punishment with its supposititious doctrine of their virtual representation in Adam is as bad an account as can possibly be rendered of the matter, and is totally without foundation. I have not met with a more striking mixture of truth and error in one vein together.

The author adds in the next page but one, " Perhaps it will be said that tho' mankind suffer in consequence of the sin of Adam, yet the sufferings of this kind which they endure are not of a *penal* nature, but salutary medicines calculated to promote their spiritual health and happiness. To this it is natural to reply, even medicines suppose sickness

“and disorder, for the whole need not
 “a physician but they that are sick.”

The reply is very just, and had the Calvinists adhered to it they might have extricated themselves out of all their difficulties; moral medicines imply a valedudinary state of virtue, as physical do of the body, and as sickness is in itself directly opposite to health and strength, so nothing can be more repugnant than to suppose with the author of the Appeal that our condition is more favourable to virtue than that of Adam was, which required no such extraordinary medicines for its support. But the Calvinist is not content with this, for he says, “Not
 “to insist on it, what can be conceived
 “more absurd than to suppose blessings
 “of any kind communicated in consequence of sin? And if the calamities
 “brought on us by the sin of Adam be
 “indeed of a salutary nature, how can
 “we be said to suffer by it? Suffer! no,
 “we are benefited. And if so, it would
 “not

“not only be hypocrisy (as the author
 “of the Appeal intimates) to pretend to
 “be sorry for this sin, but it would be
 “gross impiety and ingratitude not to be
 “thankful for it.”

There is no contradiction however, in
 supposing that blessings of the highest kind
 may be communicated in consequence
 of sin, when we consider the satisfaction
 which has made full atonement for it, and
 removed all objection from the proceed-
 ing. For tho' nothing could be more
 improbable in itself, yet the wisdom of
 God has wonderfully converted the great-
 est evil into the utmost good by this ex-
 traordinary expedient, and at the same
 time guarded against all presumption of
 impunity to future disobedience. But not
 to lay any stress on what has been so
 particularly proved to this effect, it has
 ever been a received opinion of believers,
 that the condition of mankind under the
 Second Adam will be better than it would
 have been under the first, how little idea

soever they might have of explaining the manner and occasion of it, or shewing that the fall itself is thro' Redemption made the means of their advancement to a superior state. This is not at all implied however in the supposition of the institutions mentioned being salutary medicines, and with regard to the question if the calamities brought upon us by the sin of Adam be indeed of such a nature, how can we be said to suffer by it? I answer, as we may be said to suffer by an event that brings on a disease, which may not only be very grievous in itself but also subject us to the necessity of many unpalatable and bitter remedies for the relief of it. Are not even salutary medicines in general very obnoxious circumstances, as well as the sickness and disorder that require them? And may not we undergo as much in an hospital for redress of evil, as in a dungeon for judicial punishment? This is the same oversight as the author of the Appeal was guilty of, for it is by no means a consequence of the

the foregoing principle that our situation is better in itself at present than it would have been without the fall, nor is this pretended by any except him, but only that bad as it is, it would have been abundantly worse without the medicines ordained. Sickness with the best remedies is during its continuance, but a very indifferent substitute for health, but may be the means of advancing men hereafter to a much sounder constitution than ever they had before. In such sense I scruple not to say then, that the fall with all its inconveniencies will be highly beneficial to mankind, and that to be sorry for it would betray, not hypocrisy or gross impiety and ingratitude, but only a want of better information.

The author says in the next page, " Besides, are we not depraved in consequence of Adam's sin, as well as exposed to a variety of external calamities? And can we imagine this to be a benefit? Can we look upon this to be
" a

“ a salutary medicine ? ” I answer, yes ; tho’ it is the most grievous circumstance in itself ; yet is it the greatest blessing in its effect, consequently the most salutary medicine that can be imagined. However extraordinary this may seem, it has been fully demonstrated, I trust, without any offence to innocence or uprightness, by the knowledge of evil that depravity conveys and the experimental sense it gives of the inevitable misery of sin. By shewing this the universal source of woe, and making us familiarly acquainted with the effect, it is the foundation of all our future safety and the means of securing us every blessing that Heaven is capable of affording. This was the great thing to be demonstrated, without which, every other consideration of the fall would have been of little or no consequence ; for what would it avail to prove that sorrow and death are not arbitrary punishments, but salutary means for the condition man was made subject to, without shewing likewise that this was necessary in itself ? The race might have been as well ordained to death immediately in consequence

consequence of Adam's sin, as in consequence of a disorder thereby occasioned, if there were no necessity for this disorder in the nature of things; therefore to account for the institutions upon the fall as remedies, without accounting also for the entailment of that obnoxious state which required them amounts to nothing. It is of little signification, as I said before, to shew that the appurtenances of a condition are ever so well adapted to it, when the foundation of the whole is wrong, at least not satisfactorily explained; and there appears an arbitrary evil in the substance of the thing, that all the provisions will by no means make amends for, however they may mitigate it. Medicines are very far from reconciling mankind to sickness, which is justly applicable to the moral remedies of depravity at present, without taking into view the efficacy and virtue of this toward the establishment of everlasting righteousness hereafter; a circumstance that, tho' of all things the most necessary to be shewn, seems to have been the most remote.

remote and distant from human imagination. That blessings of any kind should be communicated in consequence of sin and final forfeiture of salvation, or that the institutions upon the fall were such, appeared sufficiently improbable; the best of them did not seem to have any gracious quality belonging to them, but that depravity itself as well as death should (instead of the curse of original condemnation) be the means of eternal happiness to mankind, appeared of all absurdities and impieties the last to be conceived.

This appearance of wrath and judgment upon the face of what had the most salutary tendency in its nature, I by no means look upon as an accidental or indifferent circumstance, but wisely designed by Providence; it was as necessary that whatever was done should bear the aspect of condemnation at the time, as that the cloud should afterward be removed, and the countenance of things cleared up by the brightness of the Gospel. It was not meet that

that man should know how graciously he was dealt with immediately on the forfeiture of his salvation, or that this was no sooner incurred than the penalty discharged, and his guilt made instrumental only to his advancement to a superior state. This was too much to be revealed, too great a secret for the world to be made fully acquainted with before the necessary means to qualify so stupendous a dispensation had been accomplished. It is a common policy of princes, even when they unconditionally design a pardon, not to give full assurance of it at once, but to keep the offenders in some degree of dread and darkness for a season; it was more highly expedient then in the present instance not to vouchsafe mankind a clear prospect of their deliverance, when this could not be effected without such vast atonement that was not to be fulfilled till future and far distant ages. Perhaps it was not meet that man should be thoroughly informed at any rate of the greatness of

VOL. II. 3 B his

his pardon the instant of his transgression, or for a long time after it ; and this may have been one cause for deferring the light of the Gospel to so remote a period, viz. that the dispensation might be opened by due degrees, even with the great proviso of the death of Christ annexed. But whatever may have been the motive for not revealing the method of our Redemption sooner, the Reason is sufficiently apparent why it was not displayed in perfect lustre before the satisfaction was accomplished, since nothing but the actual completion of this could atone for the non-performance of original condemnation. Could any thing but the *accomplishment* of an equivalent have made amends for not fulfilling a fundamental law that had been so solemnly denounced, there would have been no necessity for the sacrifice of Christ ; the *execution* of this was the only thing that could atone for the non-performance of the other, and if any person will be at the pains to recollect what would have been the consequence to all future ages of such a dispensation

dispensation without any satisfaction, he will soon see that the danger would have been as great till the equivalent was fulfilled. The universe would have been laid open to the same encouragement of disobedience till the death of Christ as it would have been for ever without any such expedient, and might have been ruined in the mean time effectually. Whatever might be intended at the fall then, it was necessary that man should be kept under the idea of condemnation, and have only so much light afforded as was requisite to preserve him from absolute despair; accordingly every thing that passed was cloathed in the tremendous form of judgment, and the punishment ordained to seem substantially accomplished, so as to admit no room for hope but the possibility of a future recovery from its effect. Whatever inconvenience this appearance of things has been attended with since immortality has been fully manifested by the Gospel, the dispensation would have been incumbered with much greater in the be-

ginning had no such mask been put upon it; the exigency of which appears from what is argued to this day against supposing blessings to be communicated in consequence of sin, when men do not think of the satisfaction which should be applied upon the occasion.

But further to shew the wisdom and necessity of this disguise, as we have already considered what would have been the consequence, had the scheme of our Redemption been revealed to our first parents without any equivalent for condemnation, and meerly because the Son of God had interceded for them; let us now suppose it represented to them, not only that Christ had become an advocate but also engaged to be made a sacrifice in their behalf. In contemplation of this great event then, which in due time would certainly be fulfilled, God was pleased to discharge mankind from the present punishment of the law, and grant them a further capacity of eternal life: but had not his own Son engaged to descend

scend from the throne of Heaven into the vile condition of our nature, and undergo a most painful death therein, the race would inevitably have suffered the destruction denounced against them. Finally, whoever should become obnoxious upon this probation and forfeit the conditions of the second covenant, there would be no more sacrifice for sin, nothing but wrath and aggravated indignation to consume them.

Let this, I say, be added to the supposition maintained in vol. 1, Book 2, chap. 2, page 217, and then permit me to ask whether such denunciation of vengeance against future disobedience, with an atonement also in expectancy for past forfeiture of salvation, would not have appeared still more contemptible than the prospect there exhibited of the former, without any proposal of atonement whatsoever. After such a discharge from punishment, no additional declaration, nothing but actual performance of an equivalent

equivalent would have availed to establish the certainty of future condemnation; all extraordinary promises and threats would have only served to render it the more questionable and suspicious, and might have been justly construed as designed for nothing but to hide the nakedness of non-efficiency. The Deity (it might have been urged) could not but be conscious of the folly of not pursuing judgment in the first instance, and the equivalent might be proposed to varnish over the neglect, but was infinitely too great a substitute to be fulfilled. What was observed against denouncing a superior punishment hereafter (vol. 1, page 232) would have been equally strong in this case against the idea of so superlative and stupendous a satisfaction. Fact is a foundation of faith in a proposed event to come, and where a thing has been strictly done according to what was professed, this may even induce credit for the accomplishment of a greater afterward; but where a less has not been fulfilled

fulfilled and had a greater holden up to view for expectation in its room, this only heightens the improbability of any performance whatsoever. In short that which is now the utmost recommendation of the sacrifice, viz. its immensity which banishes all possible idea of its repetition or renewal, and consequently of any pardon similar to that which has been founded on it, would before its execution have been the greatest bar to the belief that it would ever be for once fulfilled. The proposal of it in futuro would have defeated every end that is answered by its accomplishment, and added greatly to the weight of every other circumstance insisted on in the chapter before-mentioned against the prospect of any future judgment whatsoever, as being an extravagant pretence of a complexion with all the other substance of the fable. I shall not here repeat what has been there enlarged upon, but would refer the reader to a careful recollection of it; to which I cannot but add one further circumstance that

that did not then occur to me, viz. that even the fallen angels are not yet condemned to the proper punishment ordained for them, tho' they are cast out of Heaven as mankind were out of Paradise. This is evident from St. Jude, who says in his epistle, (verse the 6th) that they are reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day; notwithstanding which their chief was able to corrupt mankind, and as we are informed in another place, still walketh about like a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour. The wisdom of deferring his punishment to the last day has been sufficiently explained, but the expediency of this was certainly an additional Reason for concealing the fulness of our release from condemnation till the equivalent was made for it, when the situation of things was such that even the destiny of the fallen angels could not be inflicted on them. For what must have been the consequence had our absolute discharge been visible, when the condemnation of much greater criminals had not

not yet obtained effect, but was put off to a future and far distant day, of which none could say when it would be? Certainly, if any such thing as punishment or equivalent were necessary to the moral government of the universe, the salvation of this world was requisite to be covered over with a thick cloud of condemnation till the one or other should be fulfilled; it was too great a mystery to be laid open to mankind or the blessed Angels, and seems one of those important secrets that it was requisite for God to reserve entirely to himself.

Nor is it possible to admire sufficiently the great wisdom and address with which this was done, so as to exclude all suspicion of the real nature of the Divine conduct upon the fall, not only till the danger of duly apprehending it should be removed, but even for many ages after this should be no more. There was no necessity for the latter, however it has come to pass; but it shews the

dexterity and depth of the contrivance that it should not be seen thro' for a long time after the true principle of the whole had been laid open, as I shall shew it was very fully by the Gospel. Men have had nothing to complain of since but their own inattention as to this point, whereas it would have been an irreparable evil if they had not laboured under an inevitable mistake before; which shews how necessary it is that the councils of Providence should sometimes be mysterious, and the fulness of truth be hidden from our eyes, when nothing but the accomplishment of things can be permitted to explain it.

Another thing to be observed is, that notwithstanding the greatness of the deception there was not the least violation of veracity in this whole affair; but every thing alleged was strictly true, tho' the design of every circumstance was concealed, and man induced by universal appearance to ascribe the transaction to a quite different

ferent motive from that which was its final cause. And God said unto Adam, *because* thou hast hearkened to the voice of thy wife and hast eaten of the fruit whereof I commanded thee saying, thou shalt not eat of it; cursed is the ground for thy sake, in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life, &c. Gen. iii. 17. Whatever ensued might very justly be attributed to the transgression, because there was not any thing ordained that would have been without it; the whole establishment originated from the fall, while at the same time not any part of it would have ever been without a further motive and design; the disobedience of Adam was the sole occasion, but not in any respect the end of all the events that followed; man was informed of nothing but the truth, yet had not the whole truth revealed to him, which was by no means necessary to be laid open, but by all means necessary to be concealed.

This will explain the meaning of many awkward circumstances that Bishop Sherlock was greatly at a loss to account for, as the darkness of the hint concerning a resurrection, that it should be given in the form of a curse upon the serpent instead of a blessing to the man, and other particulars of the like nature. Free-thinkers have contended that there was not any hope of mercy or colour for such hope afforded at the fall; in opposition to which the Bishop very justly argues, that it was both necessary for a foundation of religion at that time, and actually conveyed in the prophecy before-mentioned. Without some intimation of future mercy the condition of man would have been desperate after so absolute a forfeiture of his salvation, and the conclusion of the judgment dust thou art and unto dust thou shalt return seemed nothing less than a present confirmation of the original decree. Had our first parents been left thus (he adds) they might have continued in labour and sorrow
for

for their appointed time, and at last have returned to the dust without any well-grounded hope or confidence in God. He maintains, however, that hope was communicated in the prophecy, tho' it was but a faint light shining in a dark place, and just enough to satisfy our first parents that their case was not desperate, that some remedy or deliverance from the evil they were under would in time appear; but when, or where, or by what means, they could not understand, their own sentence which returned them back again to the dust made it difficult to apprehend what the bruising of the serpent's head should signify, or how they, who were shortly to be dust and ashes, were to be the better for it. [See his third Discourse on Prophecy, page 66.]

This seems to be an exact state of the case on both sides, and he admirably maintains the favourable appearance of the prophecy, which I would earnestly recommend to the attention of the reader.

My

My business, however, is it at present with the dark part of it, which I think is capable of further illustration than the Bishop gives it; he only tells us it is obscure in the points which God did not intend to explain at that time, and which were not necessary to be known. And in his Appendix to the same, page 292, he says, "It may seem strange, perhaps to some, that we should imagine any blessing at all to be contained in this proceeding, which is plainly a judicial one against offenders, and when nothing but their punishment is to be expected. Stranger still that we should search for this blessing upon the man, not in the part in which he himself was principally concerned, but in the part which was directed to the serpent and contains God's curse against him for his deceit. A severe sentence against one offender is seldom intended to be a pardon to another; and to this difficulty the interpretation is subject, which draws the blessing upon man from the curse upon the serpent."

This

This he endeavours to clear up by various considerations, and particularly observes, " That the passage has undeniably
 " a relation both to the woman and the
 " serpent, and might have been declared
 " (for any thing that appears from the subject matter) as well to one as the other.
 " Had it been said to the woman instead
 " of the serpent, I will put enmity, &c.
 " it shall bruise thy heel and thou shalt
 " bruise his head, there would have been
 " no ground for this objection; and I
 " cannot conceive that the words carry
 " any other sense by being spoken to the
 " serpent than they would have had by sup-
 " posing them to have been spoken to the
 " woman. There is a like instance in the
 " sentence on the woman, it is the prerogative
 " of the man to be the head of her,
 " but this superiority is not conveyed to
 " him by express grant or concession, but
 " the subjection is laid on the woman as
 " a penalty. The Reason of which (he
 " afterward observes) is that a grant of
 " this superiority would have come in
 " very

“ very improperly as a part of the sen-
 “ tence against the man; but the sub-
 “ jection on the other side came properly
 “ as a part of the sentence against the
 “ woman. Thus then the case stands;
 “ the enmity between the serpent and the
 “ woman was a curse upon the serpent
 “ and not upon the woman, therefore the
 “ advantage of the contest was necessarily
 “ to be on the woman’s side; which circum-
 “ stance, duly considered, is a great con-
 “ firmation of the hopes we derive from
 “ the curse laid upon the serpent.

This strongly shews the great perplexity
 his Lordship laboured under from the
 notion of a judicial proceeding and that
 nothing but punishment is to be expected
 in the case; the necessity of which ap-
 prehension till the satisfaction was accom-
 plished, and impropriety of it afterward,
 have both been duly manifested, I trust.
 These considerations would have extri-
 cated him out of all the difficulty at once,
 by shewing that the whole proceeding was
 requisite

requisite to be cloathed in the form of a judicial sentence, while in reality it was no such thing; and have fully accounted for every circumstance being thrown into the shape of a vindicative punishment upon the man, the woman, and the serpent, when it was meant for nothing but the salvation of mankind. With regard to what his Lordship urges, that the curse upon the serpent may for any thing that appears to us from the subject have been as well directed to the woman, this is no way consistent with the account of Moses; which as expressly tells us that God said to the serpent, I will put enmity between thy seed and her seed, it shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel, as that he said to the woman, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception, or to the man, cursed is the ground for thy sake, &c. Indeed his Lordship seems to be conscious of this himself by contending afterward that it makes no difference which of the two in question the prophecy was addressed to,

and by endeavouring to illustrate it by the sentence of subjection on the woman in favour of the man. As to what he says that the grant of superiority to the man would have come in very improperly as a part of the sentence against him, but came properly as a part of the sentence against the woman, this has a tendency toward what we have been establishing at large, and at the same time shews how far his Lordship was from a due apprehension of the matter; viz. the necessity that every part of the transaction, however it might be designed for the benefit of both, should pass under colour of a condemnation to the one or other. For the grant of superiority to the man is not in fact a greater advantage to him than to the woman, proper subordination is equally expedient in the present state for the whole human race, for those that obey as well as those that rule, and this is applicable to every other circumstance ordained at the fall among mankind; the contrary appearance
of

of which throughout, is the utmost confirmation of the hopes we found upon the promised seed of the woman, and compleatly accounts for the great blessing of our Redemption being conveyed in the form of a curse upon the serpent. As it was necessary on the one hand not to leave our first parents to despair (which would have been the consequence in their condition of not announcing something in their favour) so was it to guard against presumption on the other hand; for this would have been an extreme no less injurious to religion than the former, and must inevitably have followed if they had been permitted to see the nature of the proceeding its full lustre. Therefore was there only a faint glimmering of hope afforded them, and no more light vouchsafed than was necessary to preserve them from utter darkness.

B O O K III.

CHAPTER VI.

EXPOSITION OF SOME TEXTS AND OTHER MISCELLANEOUS MAT- TERS RELATING TO REDEMPTION.

I HAVE hitherto not attempted the proof of depravity from Scripture, but only applied it to the solution of every effect upon the fall and doctrine of Redemption, which is amply sufficient for its establishment if there were nothing further to be said concerning it; for whatever explains matters that cannot be solved without it, is unquestionably by them demonstrated. The Socinians greatly boast of its not being mentioned in the history of Moses, and tell us that all the circumstances therein specified are of a corporeal nature; but certainly it implies a meer corporeal

corporeal eye to discern nothing further, when tho' it is not expressed by name, it is necessary to the exposition of every event that is, and visible to our understanding from the whole account. Men may as well deny a Supreme Being, notwithstanding the works of nature because they do not see him, as depravity in this case because it is not mentioned; especially when there was the utmost wisdom in the omission, and it was not only unnecessary for every thing relating to the transaction to be revealed, but very improper that it should. It is on this account highly probable, that depravity was purposely concealed by Providence at the fall, because, when rightly applied, it is an universal key and comment to his administration, which was necessary to appear in great measure contrary to what it is. The existence of the thing is even to be argued from the silence with regard to it, but whether this be allowed or not, yet certainly the New Testament may be admitted to teach us
more

more than the Old; if not, why was it vouchsafed? Or for what end was the light of the Gospel granted, but to supply the deficiency of former Revelation? This I shall shew it amply does in the present instance, and that tho' Moses says not any thing of the corruption of nature, yet St. Paul who had as good opportunity of information positively asserts it; and that however I have departed from other men in the exposition of the fall, yet I have the fullest testimony of the Apostle on my side, not only as to depravity itself but the solution of mortality thereby in exclusion of the law, tho' he has been made to speak a very different doctrine.

The passage I allude to is in the epistle to the Romans, chap. v, verse 12, Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world and death by sin, and so death passed upon all, for that all have sinned. The first thing proper to be done in order to illustrate this will be to
correct

correct an error in the translation which, tho' apparently immaterial, is productive of considerable consequence in the event. The words *καὶ οὕτως* in the original which are rendered *and so*, I conceive should have been translated *even so*, or accordingly, as in the 18th verse of the present chapter. Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, *even so* (*οὕτως καὶ*) the free gift came upon all to justification. The perplexity that has arisen from not pursuing the same translation in the former of these texts will appear from the following annotation on the latter; both having by these means been strangely blended together and confounded with each other.

“Therefore, says a certain commentator, with which the 18th verse begins,
 “is not used as introducing an inference
 “from the immediately preceeding verses,
 “but is the same therefore which began
 “verse the 12th repeated here again
 “with part of the inference that was
 there

“there begun and left incompleat, the
 “continuation of it being interrupted by
 “the intervention of the proofs of the
 “first part of it. The particle *as* imme-
 “diately following wherefore, verse 12,
 “is a convincing proof of this, having
 “there, or in the following verses nothing
 “to answer it, and so leaves the sense
 “imperfect and suspended till you come
 “to this verse, where the same reasoning
 “is taken up again, and the first part of the
 “comparison is repeated ; and then the
 “latter part is added to it, and the whole
 “sentence made compleat, which to take
 “right one must read thus ; verse 12th
 “Therefore as by one man sin entered
 “into the world and death by sin, and so
 “death passed upon all men, &c. Verse
 “18, I say therefore, as by the offence of
 “one judgment come upon all to con-
 “demnation, even so by the righteousness
 “of one free-gift come upon all to justi-
 “fication of life.”

Thus

Thus we see there must be an *even* found out for *as* in the 12th verse at all events; if it have not one of its own another must be procured, tho' we travel ever so far to fetch it; the passage being necessarily imperfect otherwise, and containing a relative without a correspondent as it stands. This perplexity has been observed by many who were very remote from a conception how to rectify it; none that I have met with having entertained a notion of finding what was requisite to supply the sense within the text itself. The comparison, however, is in the 12th verse compleat between universal sin and death, as between universal condemnation and Redemption, in the 18th; and it was no less superfluous than far-fetched to blend two such distant texts together, when each, as will be shewn, contains a distinct and perfect proposition of its own.

The Socinians say, that by the phrase of sin by one man entering into the world, we are not to understand the in-

roduction of depravity at large, but only the transgression of Adam in particular; which was no other way the beginning of sin than as it happened to be the first offence committed. "The
 "Pelagians and Socinians (says Bishop
 "Burnet) agree that Adam's sin was personal, that by it as being the first sin
 "it is said that sin entered into the
 "world; but that as Adam was made
 "mortal and had died, whether he had
 "ever sinned or not, so they think the
 "liberty of human nature is still entire."
 [Burnet on the ninth Article.] But if by the expression be meant nothing more than that Adam who was the first that lived was likewise the first man who sinned, this according to the present state of things was no extraordinary information, and might have been as well omitted; nothing less could be expected or imagined, and consequently nothing could be more unnecessary to be mentioned.

But

But further, if it be the peculiar meaning of the phrase, that Adam was only the first who sinned, it cannot that he was the first who died; the entrance of death into the world by one is certainly not applicable in this sense to Adam, therefore whatever the antient Pelagians or Socinians might say of his sin being no more the occasion of mortality than depravity, yet the modern Free-thinkers have found themselves obliged to recede from part of this and allow it the efficient cause of death. In this light alone is it capable of being understood as to the last, which if duly considered will involve the same conclusion of the first; the propagation and establishment of sin being as much implied by its entrance into the world as that of death by Adam.

I say not any thing of the moral fitness between the introduction of universal sin and death together, or exact conformity in this case between the principle and effect laid down; the former being

co-extensive with the latter, and the most suitable foundation that can be in nature for it. My present purpose is to observe that nothing can be more expressly mentioned by the apostle, since after telling us that as sin entered into the world and death by sin he says, even so death passed upon all for that all have sinned. The introduction of sin and death by one is not more apparent than the propagation of each on all; the consequence, it is observed, was perfectly adapted to the cause, nor can the necessity of universal mortality from the depravity of mankind be more evident to Reason, than the institution of it thereupon is from the expression of the apostle.


It is surprizing with what confidence the assertions of many being dead thro' the offence of one and judgment coming by one to condemnation of all are urged in opposition to the preceding doctrine. For who is there that says nay to these, or what contradiction is there in them to any

any part of what has been maintained? Death came by the offence of one, but on account of the corruption which it entailed on all; the sin of Adam solely was the occasion, but the contagion thereby spread the real cause and motive of mortality without distinction; which was not an arbitrary, groundless condemnation of mankind as it appeared, but founded upon the best of Reasons, viz. the necessity of universal nature. Thus is the apostle clearly reconciled with Reason and himself, nor is one part of his account cut off but made perfectly consistent with the other; the whole of which is certainly entitled to an equal consideration and deserves the same portion of our regard.

I should have judged this quite sufficient, had not a celebrated writer contended for another interpretation of the phrase for that all have sinned; which being the case, I find myself obliged to enter into his exposition, tho' I should
not

not have thought there was any occasion for this on account of its own intrinsic merit. Mr. Locke says in his commentary on this verse, "Have sinned I have rendered became mortal, following the rule very necessary in the understanding of St. Paul's epistles, viz, the making him as much as is possible his own interpreter. 1 Cor. xv. 22, cannot be denied to be perfectly parallel to this place, this and the following verses being, as one may say, a comment on that verse to the Corinthians, St. Paul treating here of the same matter but more at large. These he says, as in Adam all die, which words cannot be taken literally, but thus; that in Adam all became mortal. The same he says here but in other words, putting by a no very unusual metonymy the cause for the effect of it on Adam, and in him on all his posterity; a mortal father infected now with death being able to produce no better than a mortal race. Why St. Paul differs in this phrase here have from

" that



"that we find he used to the Corinthians
 "and prefers here that which was hard
 "and figurative may perhaps be easily
 "accounted for, if we consider his stile
 "and usual way of writing, wherein is
 "shewn a great liking of the force and
 "bounty of Antithesis, as serving much
 "to illustration and impresson. In the
 "15th Chapter of the Corinthians he is
 "speaking of life restored by Jesus Christ,
 "and to illustrate and fix that upon their
 "minds the death of Christ best served;
 "here to the Romans he is discoursing of
 "righteousness restored to men by Christ,
 "and therefore the term sin is most na-
 "tural and proper to set that off. But
 "that neither actual nor imputed is meant
 "here nor in verse the 19th, where the
 "same expression is used; he that hath
 "need of it may see proved in Dr. Whit-
 "by on the place; if there can be any
 "need of any other proof, when it is
 "evidently contrary to St. Paul's design
 "here which is to shew that all men from
 "Adam to Moses died solely in conse-
 "quence of Adam's transgression." There

There is not any thing in Dr. Whitby, which (if I duly remember) has not been sufficiently answered in the preceding paragraph of many being dead thro' the offence of one, and that neither actual nor imputed sin is meant here I very freely grant; but that original is I contend, and am so far from thinking it St. Paul's design in the succeeding verses to shew that all men from Adam to Moses died solely in consequence of the first offence without the consideration of any other sin thereby produced, that in the sequel I doubt not to prove the contrary from this very passage. In the mean while, however, I cannot but observe that never was there greater violence committed on a word than by rendering *ἡμᾶς* became mortal; an author may at this rate be made to say any thing or nothing as his commentator pleases, the last of which is the case with St. Paul at present according to Mr. Locke. I very much approve of what he observes on all die in Adam, that it is only to be interpreted

interpreted of their being made mortal thro' him; in like manner by the phrase for that all have sinned are we to understand, not that all have actually transgressed but become sinful creatures, or had the principle of depravity implanted in them. Still, however, there is a very material difference between sin and death, and the former has no relation to the latter but that of a cause to its effect; in which respect it has indeed a very strict one, there not being a more philosophical fitness between any two things in nature than between universal corruption and mortality. There cannot be a juster Reason than the first is for the second, but what does Mr. Locke, according to his method of interpretation, make the apostle say? Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world and death by sin, even so death passed upon all for that all have become mortal! A very extraordinary matter of information indeed! For not to say any thing of destroying the proper distinction and connection between sin and death, both which are

so manifestly asserted, it might have as well been said, that the institution of the latter passed upon mankind because it did as because they were made mortal, which constitutes the very essence of its appointment and is absolutely the same thing. There was no necessity for an express Revelation to convey to us any such instruction, it would have been better to say nothing, and Mr. Locke himself has not been deficient on other occasions in exposing all such idle, frivolous, and identical assertions.

As much as Dr. Whitby, Mr. Locke, and the Socinians fall short of the proper interpretation of this verse, the Calvinists unnecessarily go beyond it; "Who
 "(according to Bishop Burnet) render *for*
 "*that, in whom* all have sinned. They
 "think indeed it is all one to their point
 "which way it is rendered; for tho' the
 "latter words seem to deliver their opinion
 "on more precisely, yet it being affirmed
 "ed that according to the other rendering
 "all

“all who die have sinned; and it being
 “certain that many infants die who
 “never actually sinned, these must have
 “sinned in Adam, they could sin no other
 “way.” [Burnet on the ninth Article.]

I mention this to shew how some have disgraced this admirable passage by incumbering it with error and superstition, as well as others disfigured it by mutilating and maiming it of a most essential part. For tho' infants never actually sinned, yet are they in the same predicament with regard to the moral necessity of death as if they had, and are equally included in the Reason of the thing. They labour under unavoidable imperfection of nature, and we may safely judge what they who quitted this life in infancy would have been, if they had attained maturity, from what those who arrived to it always have been. It is not more certain that all who live will die, than that all who die would have sinned, if they had lived long enough to be capable of action; if any but idiots ever died without this, it was only because

death deprived them of the power; therefore since the principle of sin is equally annexed to infants, the event of death is equally essential to them; it being very immaterial as to the thing itself, since it must arrive, at what particular period of life it comes.

Nor is the construction of the letter in this passage by any means so singular as may be imagined; St. Paul expresses in miniature by *ημαρτον* only here what he represents at large in a parallel place of the same Epistle, (Rom. iii. chap. 23d verse) *πάντες γὰρ ἡμαρτον καὶ υστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ* for all have failed and are become deficient of the glory or perfection of their Maker. It is easy to give as familiar an illustration of *πολλοὶ κατεσθῆσαν αμαρτωλοὶ* in the 19th verse of the 5th chapter, if there be any occasion for it. This is perfectly similar to the passage in the Gospel of St. Luke, (5—8) wherein St. Peter, smitten with astonishment at the miraculous draught of fishes, says to our Saviour,

ἐξέλθε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἀμαρτωλὸς εἰμι Κύριε
 depart from me for I am a sinful man,
 O Lord.

But the most curious circumstance of the calvinistical interpretation is, how they who were incapable of transgressing in themselves could be guilty of it in their first parents! Or who could not sin in infancy, should commit it before they were born! This is a mysterious affair, and the Calvinists are not a little divided from the Catholics about it. "Protestants say
 " that the sin of the first man is imputed
 " to his descendants, they being looked
 " upon as culpable and punished as such
 " on account of the sin of Adam. Catho-
 " lics hold that this is not enough, we are
 " not *esteemed* and punished as criminals,
 " say they, but are actually criminal our-
 " selves by the original sin." [Chambers's Dictionary on the word Imputation.] It must be confessed the Catholics have the advantage of the Protestants in pursuance of the construction alluded to; for if the
 phrase

phrase must imply actual sin, infants have no more committed this according to the account of the latter in their first parents than their own person, but are only considered as parties in his offence by imputation. And if they might sin thus in him by imputation, they might as well do it in themselves by the same means ; the matter is not made at all more intelligible by this fiction, however agreeable it may be to the notion of their sustaining the judicial punishment of Adam. It must be confessed that sin cannot be more effectually imputed to any than by involving them in its legal penalty ; but as the Calvinists contended that this could not be done by a Being of supreme Perfection without their being justly liable to be treated as parties in the offence, they might have as well concluded from hence that all must have been actually criminal themselves in the affair. The notion of a judicial punishment is not at all amended by the doctrine that Adam contracted for his descendants as well as for himself, who being virtually in his loins were presumed to give consent to what he did ; for they might as well

well be presumed to commit his sin as give consent to any covenant that he made before they were born. What should induce the Calvinists to dwell so much upon this as they have done is not easy to be conceived, unless it is the republican principle that prevailed among them, which makes *Representation* a matter of most sacred obligation, and indeed the only thing that men are liable to be bound by. If this be the case, they certainly have carried their political notion too far in the present instance, and whatever may be its excellency for the preservation of freedom in any human government, it has been prostituted to support the doctrine of tyranny in the Divine, by being applied to the justification of such pains and penalties as need not now be mentioned. I think I have given a better account of the latter administration on the contrary principle that is not so popular, viz. *salus populi suprema lex*; by shewing the necessity of death in order to the good of all mankind,

mankind, and that there was no need of asking their consent, or proving that any consent was given to its appointment; the advantage of the thing sufficiently recommends itself.

I now proceed to the 13th and 14th verses. For until the Law sin was in the world, but sin is not imputed where there is no law; nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come. Mr. Locke derives his invincible plea from hence to prove that no other sin could be meant in the foregoing verses than that of Adam in particular; "Because no
 "man can incur a penalty without the
 "sanction of a positive law declaring and
 "establishing that penalty; but death was
 "annexed by no positive law to any sin
 "but the eating of the forbidden fruit;
 "and therefore man's dying before the
 "law of Moses was purely in consequence

“ quence of Adam’s offence in eating the
 “ forbidden fruit, and the positive sanc-
 “ tion of death annexed to it an evi-
 “ dent proof of man’s mortality coming
 “ from thence.”

It is needless to say any thing of mortality coming by or from the sin of Adam, as it was never questioned: and it is altogether as superfluous, to contend that it was not the legal penalty ordained, since it has been so often proved that this would have been both immediate and eternal, nor would the present life and death any more than a resurrection have ever been in conformity therewith; every one of these was equally a dispensation from it, and in order to a removal of it. I cannot but animadvert, however, on what Mr. Locke says, that mortality could not be in consideration of any other sin than that of eating the forbidden fruit, because no other had death by any particular law entailed upon it; as if the Supreme Author and Disposer of life could not

VOL. II. 3 G deprive

deprive man of it without his incurring a previous provision of law for the purpose! Here again we have a strong tincture of the political constitution men have been accustomed to, for it must be confessed that the matter in question exceeds the prerogative of a British Sovereign; but the Monarch of Heaven is not circumscribed or bound by any limitation besides that of his own Reason, and without any law expressly ordaining death, we have shewn that by the degeneracy of the species there became ample occasion for it in the nature of things; its institution became thereupon in itself a law, like that of an universal Retribution in the next life, to which it is so essential and without which the Divine attributes cannot be justified.

If the prohibition of the forbidden fruit had been without any penalty annexed, or mankind been brought into their present condition without breach of any prohibition, it would have been necessary that

that they should die; the constitution of things required it at all events. But what I am most surprized at is, that Dean Sherlock, who was so sensible of this, should fall so directly into the same mistake with Mr. Locke. He says in like manner, that the design of this place is to prove that men are not made mortal for their own sin, because till the giving of the Law of Moses there was no law which threatened death against it; and no man can be presumed to die for that which no law punishes with death; this could be therefore for no other sin but Adam's. [See his Treatise on Death, chap ii. sec. 1. page 60.] He very largely proves, however, in the same chapter the absolute necessity of death to this corrupt estate upon its own account, and adds, "That considering the fallen condition
 "of mankind it was not fitting, it was
 "not for their benefit that they should
 "be immortal here; both the wisdom,
 "goodness, and justice of God required
 "that they should die." How then was

it impossible for mortality to be on account of any other sin than that of Adam? Or what occasion for any positive penalty to explain its prevalence in such case? I mention this to shew not only how Calvinists and Socinians have erred, but how far a Divine who had the best notion of what succeeded upon the fall was from making any advantage or improvement of it with regard to a Redemption; how he stuck in the idea of original condemnation, while he contended that the consequence was necessary to the purpose of a Restoration; and must needs impute it to the penalty of the Law, as if there had been no such thing as a Redemption from this; or the present death had no beneficial tendency toward it. Well may the most opposite extremes have united in the same mistake, when a person who had the justest apprehension of the case could not emerge from it.

But the most extraordinary circumstance is, that there should be so remarkable a concurrence

currence in deriving the doctrine that death must have been a legal penalty incurred by breach of some positive law from the present passage, which directly declares the contrary by shewing that death equally prevailed where there was no such thing as any positive law to be transgressed or penalty thereof incurred. For until the Law sin was in the world, concerning which there is no doubt that it means the Law of Moses from what follows of death reigning from Adam to him; the only question is what connection the Mosaic institution has with the subject, or how it can have any thing to do with the introduction of sin and death. This may admit of various conjectures, among which, whoever considers the prejudice of the Jews in favour of their ceremonial law, how they inculcated the necessity of its observance upon the Gentiles as the only means of justification and eternal life (if the latter could be saved upon any terms at all) may perhaps be induced to think that this is aimed at the presumption of the former

former. In opposition to them the Apostle seems to say, they were by no means to suppose that offending against their beggarly elements and sordid institutions (which were only types and shadows of better things to come) could occasion the loss of immortality, for death had dominion over all before the Mosaical establishment as well as after; its introduction therefore cannot be attributed to any transgression of this in particular, nor as it is impossible to think that men were ordained to die on its account, can their paying of any respect and reverence thereto as such be esteemed essential in the nature of things toward regaining life. It was deviation from a more fundamental righteousness that occasioned the suspension of immortality, and this is therefore the only thing to be regarded in order to its recovery.

Whether this may be fairly concluded from what the Apostle says I leave the reader to determine; but if it be not
 approved

approved there is another solution to be offered, which is as follows: St. Paul very often argues against the Jews, that vain was their confidence in their ceremonial law, for by it all men are concluded under sin; as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse, and it is written, cursed is every one that continueth not in all things that are written in the works of the law to do them. Gal. iii. 10. On the present foundation then we may reasonably suppose him arguing thus: it may seem no wonder perhaps that death should continually prevail after the institution of Moses, as no man ever could pretend any such exact obedience to it in all things; still less surprizing may it appear that Adam should die before, as he had expressly incurred the loss of life by breach of the original law ordained him; that men, however, should die from him to Moses, who had not become obnoxious to it by sinning against any provision it was particularly entailed upon, can only be referred to the principle before-mentioned,

before-mentioned, viz. the universal corruption of the species that at all times required this event and consequence.

But whatever may have been the motive of introducing the law of Moses upon this occasion, nothing can be plainer than that the argument of the Apostle is quite contrary to what the commentators have made it. He says, but sin is not imputed where there is no law, the meaning of which cannot be that where there is no positive law there is not any thing to be accounted sin; for besides the contradiction of this to all common sense and Reason, it would be directly opposite to what the Apostle had said in the beginning of the Epistle, that as many as have sinned without law should likewise perish without law, that the Gentiles having not the law are by their conscience accusing or else excusing them a law unto themselves, and to the severity with which he had accordingly treated them for their enormities against the light of nature. —

The

The sense of the phrase is that whatever sin is committed, it cannot be considered as the breach of any positive law in particular, when there was no such law in being; nevertheless it is said, death reigned from Adam to Moses, long before the institution of the latter was established, and after that ordained to the former in Paradise was removed; it was therefore no more on account of the sin against the forbidden fruit (exclusive of any other thereby occasioned) than of disobedience to the law of Moses in particular, because it equally prevailed when men were incapable of committing either. Strange as it may seem what the Jewish law could have to do with this affair, or how it should be connected with the original of death which was so long prior to its establishment; yet was it admirably calculated (if any thing could have been sufficient for this purpose) to root out the inveterate prejudice of imputing mortality to the sin of Adam solely without the consideration of any other circumstance whatever. As in the

preceding verse the Apostle ascribes the introduction of death to sin, and explains the universality of the effect by that of the principle it was founded on; so does he confirm this in the present, by shewing that death could not be imputed to the cause it was commonly ascribed to, because it equally predominated where no such cause existed; over men who had no more sinned, after the similitude of Adam, than the Jews nor against any positive law whatever with the supposed penalty of death annexed to it: Consequently mortality cannot be resolved into this as such, and men may justly be presumed to die for that which no law punishes with death, because the corruption of nature, without any other principle, is sufficient at all times to require the event. Light cannot be more contrary to darkness than St. Paul is to his commentators throughout this passage; nothing can be more rational than the Apostle, nothing more irrational than they make him, as he argues, there is the most perfect conformity between the cause
and

and the effect; as they represent the case, there is no consistency at all between these. Death is extended in the most arbitrary manner over all who had no concern in the cause assigned for it, and when it was impossible for any such cause to have a being, instead of being shewn an event that all have in every period equally participated in the ground of.

Some have supposed that by those who sinned not after the similitude of Adam are denoted infants, because they never committed any actual trespass. — But this no way comes up to the proper meaning of the phrase, as it makes no distinction between the sin of Adam and that of every other wilful transgressor. Infants have no more sinned after the similitude of any other man than Adam ; and it is no more in the power of any other man than infants to sin after the similitude of him ; whose offence amounted to a total forfeiture of salvation while he continued yet alive, and not with-

standing a Redemption occasioned so fundamental a corruption of his nature. The reason why the Apostle insists upon this, is not his imagining it could be supposed that any man ever committed the like offence to that of eating the forbidden fruit; but from the notorious impossibility of the thing to demonstrate the absurdity of imputing universal death to it in exclusion of all other sin thereby produced, and to shew that they might as well ascribe this to breach of the Mo-
saic law as of that ordained to Adam on its own account. So deep a root however had the contrary persuasion struck into the minds of men that nothing could eradicate it, even the most positive contradiction of the Apostle was adjudged to prove it.

I now proceed to the 18th and 19th verse of the present chapter, which I humbly conceive the commentators have likewise greatly mistaken the meaning of,
and

and which will deserve an attentive consideration. Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one the free-gift came upon all to justification of life ; for as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, even so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous. Here, as Mr. Locke observes, St. Paul resumes the thread of the discourse that had been interrupted and broken off at the end of the 14th verse which mentions Adam as a type or counterpart of him that was to come ; in conformity with which the Apostle says at present, that as by one man's offence judgment came upon *all men* to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one the free-gift came on *all* to justification of life.

The first clause of this perhaps may seem to stare me in the face, who have constantly asserted that there was no such thing

thing as any judicial penalty inflicted upon mankind in Adam. for what can be a stronger affirmation of this than that judgment came on all to condemnation by him? The phrase indeed is very emphatical and striking, yet whoever can be prevailed upon to look beyond the letter into the nature of the thing in question, will soon find that the former cannot be meant as it is usually understood, and that it carries not the least inconsistency with our account. The Calvinist (as we have shewn in Vol. 1, page 74) contends from the strength of the expression that it signifies a condemnation to eternal death, and so indeed it must if it imply the execution of the law, as nothing less was originally denounced thereby. But that eternal death of any kind came not to pass in Adam we need no other proof than a Redemption, and that man never laboured for a moment under any verbal sentence or condemnation of it is evident from the account

account in Genesis which tells us, that before he was adjudged to die the promise of a resurrection was conferred. It is plain then that the sentence of the law was superseded as to the fundamental part before any judgment passed; which being the case, it would be scarce worth while but for the sake of consistency to dispute about the execution of the remainder, (if our position had not been so clearly proved that temporal death was no more inflicted than eternal in *pursuance of the law*, when the infinitely greatest circumstance that swallows up every other consideration was beyond a doubt dispensed with. But it may be asked, did no judgment or condemnation whatsoever come to pass then, and is it possible for two such powerful expressions to be used without any meaning? My answer is that I do not say this, whatever may have been apprehended; there was a very sufficient judgment and condemnation that came on all by the depravity entailed in the constitution

stitution of things on sin, from which mankind, notwithstanding a Redemption, were no more exempted than the fallen angels, if we except the remedies applied; and these, however salutary for the disease, were at the same time such bitter potions as to be very heavy punishments in themselves. Whatever ensued however was not the judicial but only natural penalty of sin, this is applicable to depravity with all its obnoxious consequences, and reconciles the Apostolical expression of judgment coming upon all to condemnation with our account of their being totally exempted from the legal punishment, the full accomplishment of which is inconsistent with a Redemption.

As to the next clause, even so by the righteousness of one the free-gift came upon all men to justification of life, in this I believe I shall no less differ from all the commentators than I have done from the Calvinists in the foregoing, by asserting that it has no more relation to eternal life than

than the other has to eternal death. That it cannot imply the gift of immortality or deliverance from future condemnation is manifest, for this will be the portion of the saints only, who will fall considerably short in number of the universal body of mankind. Expositors have therefore agreed, for the most part, in explaining this sentence not of the event but possibility or purpose of Redemption, asserting that all were equally ordained for everlasting life and made capable thereof by Christ, tho' through their own misconduct they will not obtain the actual enjoyment and possession of it.

I shall not insist at present on the absurdity of making a distinction between the ultimate design and issue of the Divine proceedings, or of supposing that Christ died for a meer possibility that he knew would never have effect, which was so far dying for no end or purpose whatsoever. I shall say more of this hereafter, but the error of the interpretation mentioned will

be sufficiently evident from hence, that St. Paul is speaking in the present verse of the real accomplishment and consequence of things. This will not be doubted of judgment coming upon all to condemnation, why should it then of the free-gift coming in like manner upon all to justification of life? To which we may add that the Apostle is explaining the correspondence intimated above between the first and second Adam, in that as the one was the occasion of an universal judgment, so was the other of as universal a deliverance, nor was the condemnation of all to death more real, than their being rescued from perdition to life notwithstanding. How this is to be understood there is no difficulty to imagine according to our scheme, which makes the parallel compleat between the persons mentioned, and shews the one an exact type or counterpart to the other; whereas the conformity will in great measure be destroyed, if we interpret the former clause of an effect of condemnation, the latter of a design or purpose

pose only of Redemption which never will come to pass, but on the contrary be very far distant from the event.

Indeed the method of expounding the two sentences so differently would never have been thought of but from absolute necessity ; men were very sensible that the free-gift coming upon all to justification of life could not be applied to their attainment of eternal happiness, and they had no idea of any other state the phrase might be referred to, the present being attributed to perdition and universally deemed the effect of original condemnation. There was no possibility therefore of conceiving how the passage could relate to any other condition than that of immortality, tho' it could not be applied to the enjoyment of this or a release from future condemnation, which drove them from the idea of any actual deliverance to life to that of a capacity only of receiving it. Our hypothesis, however, removes all the difficulty by shewing that as by the offence of

be sufficiently evident from hence, that St. Paul is speaking in the present verse of the real accomplishment and consequence of things. This will not be doubted of judgment coming upon all to condemnation, why should it then of the free-gift coming in like manner upon all to justification of life? To which we may add that the Apostle is explaining the correspondence intimated above between the first and second Adam, in that as the one was the occasion of an universal judgment, so was the other of as universal a deliverance, nor was the condemnation of all to death more real, than their being rescued from perdition to life notwithstanding. How this is to be understood there is no difficulty to imagine according to our scheme, which makes the parallel compleat between the persons mentioned, and shews the one an exact type or counterpart to the other; whereas the conformity will in great measure be destroyed, if we interpret the former clause of an effect of condemnation, the latter of a design or purpose

pose only of Redemption which never will come to pass, but on the contrary be very far distant from the event.

Indeed the method of expounding the two sentences so differently would never have been thought of but from absolute necessity ; men were very sensible that the free-gift coming upon all to justification of life could not be applied to their attainment of eternal happiness, and they had no idea of any other state the phrase might be referred to, the present being attributed to perdition and universally deemed the effect of original condemnation. There was no possibility therefore of conceiving how the passage could relate to any other condition than that of immortality, tho' it could not be applied to the enjoyment of this or a release from future condemnation, which drove them from the idea of any actual deliverance to life to that of a capacity only of receiving it. Our hypothesis, however, removes all the difficulty by shewing that as by the offence of

Adam human life was shortened, so was it in pursuance of Redemption that it continued after that event at all; every man as much derives his positive existence from the one, as its mortality from the other; nor can any thing more compleatly coincide than every syllable of this passage with our system. The first point we established was that the present state could not be justified without another; the next that it belonged as much as the resurrection to the free-gift of Redemption, and the last that it could no more be justified without the condition than end of this, or without the sacrifice of Christ than a final restitution. On these two principles only could it properly be rescued from perdition and reconciled to the Divine Perfection, and that the apostle alludes to both in the establishment of the present state is evident from the whole passage. That by the righteousness of one is meant the obedience of Christ to death was never doubted by any who believed the doctrine of Atonement, nor is it less obvious that in the next verse

verse St. Paul refers to the future restitution of mankind in order to the final justification of the world. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, even so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous; here is explained the real ground and motive of each proceeding as I presume will not be doubted of the first, viz. that by the offence of one judgment came on all to condemnation because they were made sinners, or in other words sinful creatures by it. The matter is equally apparent too that St. Paul describes, the end of the present life and Redemption by many shall be made righteous, which signifies that as men were corrupted by disobedience which occasioned their mortality, so in pursuance of this evil state thro' the satisfaction will they hereafter be made perfect, and qualified beyond danger for eternal happiness. The meaning of St. Paul in this place is the same with that of St. Peter in another, wherein he says we expect a new Heaven and earth in which dwelleth righteousness;

righteousness; i. e. integrity without alloy, and free from all mixture of imperfection. How this will be accomplished so as never to fail again by the justification or deliverance of all men from perdition to the present state thro' the satisfaction of Christ and free-gift of Redemption has been sufficiently explained; what I propose at present is to shew, that the Apostle pursues the same vein of Reason in this place as I have done throughout the foregoing system. Nothing can more compleatly coincide in every particular than the one does with the other, but the passage was so insuperably darkened by a contrary persuasion which men came to it with the pre-possession of, that the sense of it has hitherto lain buried under the cloud. So deeply were they involved in the prejudice of original condemnation which they received from Moses, and it was necessary they should labour under 'till the death of Christ, that this has confounded the clearest illustration which could be given of it afterward. The comment has been overcome

come by the first oversight, instead of the first oversight being obviated and done away by the comment.

Mr. Locke contends that the word *many*, in both parts of the 19th verse, must be equal, and that the Apostle means in each instance all; but in opposition to this I ask, why St. Paul uses not all in the present as well as the preceding verse? There he says that as judgment came on *all* to condemnation so did the free-gift on *all* to justification of life, because the universal body of mankind is in each case included. Here, however, he changes his expression in conformity to the occasion, all were made sinful by the fall, but all will not be made finally holy and happy thro' Redemption; the Apostle therefore makes use of *many*, this being a word of indefinite signification and at the same time applicable to different numbers. Thus also in the 12th verse he says, death passed upon *all* for that *all* have sinned, the cause and effect being equally universal;

fal; and in that passage to the Corinthians which Mr. Locke is so fond of illustrating the foregoing by, as in Adam *all* die even so in Christ shall *all* be made alive; which shews sufficiently that he is not any way abstemious with regard to the use of all, where it is applicable in both cases. In the 15th verse, however, of this chapter he says, if by the offence of one *many* be dead; much more hath the grace of God, &c. abounded unto *many*; the number not being of equal extent in each part, and the latter clause (as we have particularly shewn) being only applicable to the saints who shall actually reign in life. See Vol. I. page 209.

Nothing can be more curious than Mr. Locke's interpretation of this passage from beginning to end; we have seen how he explains many were made sinners of their being rendered mortal, whereby St. Paul is made to say the same thing as he had done in the verse before by judgment coming upon all to condemnation,

ation, their being made subject to the present death being universally understood thereby. The one is assigned too as a Reason for the other, which makes the matter infinitely worse, and men are said to be made mortal for no better cause than that they were made mortal. But as if this were not enough, the same extraordinary vein of argument is pursued in the remaining part of the subject by making many constantly synonymous to all; whereby it is implied in like manner that the free-gift came on all to justification, because all will be justified or made righteous by it. Mr. Pyle who follows the Socinian interpretation was sensible of this impropriety, and accordingly has dropt all attention to the 19th verse as if there were not any such in being; it is not struck out of the text, but very evidently omitted in the paraphrase.

The controversy that has so long subsisted concerning the extent of Christ's

VOL. II.

3 K

death

death and satisfaction cannot but occur on this occasion; nor can I abstain at present from insisting on the error of those who deny the universality of Redemption in effect, or assert that of everlasting salvation in design; each of whom appear to me to have been guilty of an extreme and to have been involved in it in some measure by blending two very different circumstances together. It seems strange there should have been any occasion to contend that all in one part of the 18th verse must be equal to all in the other; the thing is so unquestionable in itself that it appears impossible there should be any dispute concerning it; this there has been however, and the Arminians have had no less difficulty to convince the Calvinists that all were justified in life by Christ, as fully as they were involved in judgment of death by Adam, than the Calvinists have the Arminians that many may be applied to different numbers, and that the everlasting salvation of all men could

could not be the influencing motive of Redemption. This perplexity has proceeded in great measure from not having a proper notion of what the original deliverance of mankind consisted in, and from confounding it with the final justification of the blessed, which cannot be referred to all. The Calvinists considered the present death as the effect of original condemnation and had no idea of any Redemption by Christ but what consisted in rescuing them from this by a resurrection to Eternal life; the only reprobation they supposed was that of leaving men to continue in the state of perdition they were in by reason of Adam's sin, and since it was certain that not all would be delivered from final death, hence it was impossible for the Calvinists to conceive how they should be from original, or in what manner the free-gift could come on all to justification of life.

Nor have the Arminians been able to give any better solution of the matter on account of their being involved in the same mistake as to this life being meerly the consequence of original condemnation; they therefore attribute the universality of Redemption to a gracious purpose and design only with regard to it, asserting that God equally intended it for the benefit of all, tho' many frustrate this good intention by their own folly and perverseness. Thus are the passages interpreted wherein Christ is declared to be the Saviour of the world, and God to have sent him not to judge the world but that the world thro' him might be saved: concerning which Dr. Barrow says, "That world which was made by him, and whereof a great part he would in effect both judge and condemn for unbelief and disobedience he did primarily come upon intent to save." [See Barrow on Universal Redemption, vol. 2, ser. 33, page 282.] But how he could primarily come upon intent to do what he

he certainly foreknew never would be done is not very easy to be imagined; there are two causes that have concurred to favour this interpretation, viz. the supposed impossibility of shewing Christ the Saviour of the whole world any other way than in design, and the necessity that he should be such in this respect, at least with regard to a future state, whatever might be the event; both which suppositions are equally without foundation.

Concerning the first, it is now almost superfluous to say, that Christ was not more the Maker than Saviour of the whole world; it owes not its life and being to him less in the latter capacity than the former, since it was rescued from perdition by him in our first parents, and the extinction of the whole human race prevented after the manner so often mentioned. He came not on a blind errand, much less on a contradictory design, but what he came to do he did, and was as much the author of temporal deliverance to all, as
he

he will be of eternal to the saints ; because, all would have perished if he had not died for them ; and by virtue of his doing it, they were released and justified from original condemnation so as to become partakers of the present life. Nor is it any contradiction to his being called the Saviour of the world, with respect to what is past, when the purpose of his mission is described as future, or God is said to have sent him *to be* the Saviour of the world ; since he came to perform the atonement whereby alone the world could be saved, tho' the deliverance itself was past and long prior in accomplishment to the necessary condition of procuring it.

I do not mean, however, to confine all the passages of this kind to the foregoing interpretation, there is another sense wherein God may be said to have sent his Son to be the Saviour of the world, according to which the salvation of it is future ; but this I believe is likewise
such

such as was scarce ever thought of on the occasion. My idea is that the world was not only rescued from perdition in the first instance, but will finally be restored by Christ in glory, and converted into an everlasting habitation for the blessed, who will constitute a sufficient number to replenish it. In this sense he will be the Author of Eternal as he was before of temporal preservation to it, the new Heaven and Earth, however, in which dwelleth righteousness will be only for the many that are obedient in the present life, nor can this salvation of the world be applied like the foregoing to every one that is ever born into it,

In the last sense alone are to be understood the passages, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; (2 Cor. v. 19) that he is a propitiation for our sins, and not only ours, but also for the sins of the whole world, 1 John ii. 2. That is, God was so far reconciled to the sins of the whole

whole world that they prevailed not to the perdition of the human race in the first man, which the prospect of them would have done, had not that of the Christian Sacrifice prevented it, and proved a dispensation for all that corruption to exist which was certain to ensue from the beginning to the end of the present system. The Calvinist contends that, " If God received " a sufficient satisfaction and oblation for " the sins of the whole world, it is not re- " concileable with justice that all should not " be saved by it." [Burnet on the 17th Article.] To which I answer that they were, so far as it was intended that they should be saved by it; the satisfaction being never meant for a release from any future punishment, but for a deliverance long since past, of which all are equal partakers. But unhappily the Calvinist had no notion of the Sacrifice having a respect to any thing but a release from final death at the last day, which it bears no immediate relation to. For evangelical obedience is the only thing that will be of any service
to

to save men then, the merit of Christ will not contribute to this in the least beyond what it has already done, viz. as it procured a possibility of such obedience to be accepted by hindering the corruption of human nature from occasioning its original destruction. The foregoing argument is wholly founded on a false application of the atonement, which indeed is a stumbling-block of error that has never been properly overcome by any.

Dr. Barrow says, " The Holy Scripture
 " doth so fully and clearly declare this
 " truth of universal justification that scarce
 " any other Christian doctrine can allege
 " more ample and plain testimony for it;
 " whence it is wonderful that any pre-
 " tending reverence to Scripture should
 " *dare* (upon consequences of their own
 " devising) to question it." [Ser. 33.]

It is some excuse for the Calvinists, however, that the consequences referred to were so clear and cogent that there was no possibility of avoiding them; the event

to which the justification of all to life was supposed to allude would by no means bear the application of universal, and it is very remarkable (as I have said all along) that how severely soever the Calvinists have been condemned, they have seldom been corrected or set right by any of their opponents. Others have reformed on them in the same manner as I have shewn they did upon the Catholics, viz. without any fundamental improvement or amendment. The Arminians, in particular, are firmly fixed at present to the same root of error, and all the advantage of their doctrine is to explain the Universality of Redemption by a fiction that amounts to nothing less than a repugnancy. For as to the exposition that the Eternal salvation of all men was the gracious meaning of Christ's Redemption, whatever may be the consequence, or however his intention may be frustrated by the wickedness of mankind; I say there is not a greater contradiction than to suppose that a scheme could

could possibly be the motive of his death which he infallibly foreknew would not be brought to pass by it; or that his ultimate end was such as he was previously certain would never be fulfilled. However specious and popular this construction may be, there is not any thing that carries a greater absurdity in itself; while it pays a seeming compliment to the intention of the Divine Being, it casts the greatest reproach upon his conduct, and charges him with such inconsistency and folly as no man in his sound mind ever would be guilty of; viz. that of doing an extraordinary act for nothing, which was the case so far as he died for a purpose that he knew never would be answered by it.

If it be asked, What was the precise design of Christ's coming into the world? I answer, the consummation of nature or accomplishment of that great event which would not have been without, but was certain to be compleated by it; the

consequence of his not coming would have been the perdition of all men without exception, that of his doing it will be the secure possession of eternal life to many; such and no other was the real end of his errand from the beginning. Milton in this respect very properly represents the Father saying to the Son before the fall of Adam,

As in him perish all men, so in thee
 As from a second root shall be restored
 As many as are restored, without thee none.

I would further ask those who contend that nothing less than the Eternal salvation of all men was the object of Redemption, whether they suppose that Christ would have undergone what he did for it, if he had foreseen that not any would attain to immortality thereby as he did that many would not? I think I may safely answer for them that he would not have submitted to what he did, with a certain knowledge that no
 good

good would be produced by it ; it may be said, perhaps, it could not be expected, but that some would make a due improvement of the opportunity vouchsafed, nor could it be supposed that all would defeat the extraordinary means of grace afforded them. This I freely grant but add, it was as certain that many would not pursue the one thing needful as that many would ; Christ must have therefore been determined in his undertaking by the latter only who he saw would be sufficient for the purpose of his kingdom, and well worthy of his acquisition, notwithstanding those that would not be saved. Never does any man pursue an extraordinary enterprize for what he knows will be lost, but for what he expects notwithstanding to be gained by it ; the prospect of this is the sole motive that impels him, the other would be acting for an end that is *worse* than nothing : thus is the consideration of what Christ would

would not have died without (as well as of the advantage that would not have been without his death but was certain to be accomplished thro' it) a just criterion whereby to judge of what he underwent it for. Our Saviour says to the Jews himself, ye believe not because ye are not of my sheep; my sheep hear my voice, and I know them and they follow me; and I give unto them Eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand. My Father who gave them to me is greater than all, and none shall be able to pluck them out of my hand. John x. 26, 27, &c. That is, how many soever may fall off, the salvation of an adequate number will be effectually secured; Christ died not for a contingency, much less for a contradiction (or a circumstance that he knew would never come to pass and was chimerical to be expected) but for the good he saw would actually be produced, and prevail notwithstanding

withstanding all exceptions that might occur to it.

The declarations that God's tender mercies are over all his works, that he hath no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but is willing that all should be brought to repentance and be saved are not any way inconsistent with the foregoing. There is no doubt that this would be most agreeable to the Divine goodness, but it may not be possible in the nature of things; Christ certainly died for the greatest good that could be obtained, and nothing can be more repugnant than perdition to the direct end both of Creation and Redemption. In this sense it may be truly said he came not to judge the world but that the world thro' him might be saved; condemnation was no part of his purpose however it may abound, and tho' he saw that in relation to great numbers he must unavoidably be driven to it. God hath no more
pleasure

pleasure in the death of a sinner than delight in sin, which must be highly offensive to his nature; and yet we have shewn that he purposely permitted the propagation of it in order that he might advance his creatures thereby to greater perfection than they were capable of without it. Very few have imagined the fall essential to the everlasting welfare of mankind and Angels, we have proved, however, that nothing could be more so; nor is this to be supposed only of the fall but final condemnation of many, as we have likewise demonstrated of the apostate angels, without whose perdition intellectual nature never could be made secure from danger, or the Divine image capable of a completion in it. The ruin of these beyond recovery could not by any means be acceptable to their Creator in itself, but he foresaw that it was inevitable, and determined notwithstanding to proceed in the great work of establishing his moral system; the perfection of which was even founded on the certainty

tainty of their perdition, and the advantage to be derived from it as well as from all the other evil that their revolt would be the occasion of. The final condemnation of many among mankind may justly be included in the same predicament, viz. that however dreadful it may be in itself, it was perceived essential to the good of the whole system, and accordingly admitted as a necessary instrument toward this; all that can be required for the justification of the scheme is that it be sufficient to preponderate notwithstanding, and make amends for all the evil it must unavoidably be attended with. When a General sends his troops into the field of battle it is not expedient he should propose that not any of them should perish (for nothing can be more chimerical) but only that the advantage in contemplation be sufficient to counterbalance the loss that must be sustained. The same is applicable to the Captain of our spiritual warfare, viz. that however grateful to him the final salvation of all would be,

it was neither requisite nor possible for him to have any such design in the plan of their Redemption; since according to the circumstances of the case this would be no better than a dream, and what a common Commander could never be supposed capable of proposing in any arduous undertaking when awake. Much less, I think then, would any such inconsistency have been imputed to the great Leader of our salvation but from absolute necessity; nothing, except the violence of this, could have ever driven men to embrace such a contradiction, but the misfortune is that they have had (comparatively speaking) very little notion of the good that our Redemption will be the occasion of and an idea of abundantly more evil than the ultimate event of it will be attended with. The former I have already shewn, and the latter I propose to do hereafter; so that all exceptions to the goodness of the scheme shall appear no more than spots upon the sun, and there shall be no necessity for imputing
to

to our Saviour any better purpose than he had in view, or council than he knew would be fulfilled. The badness of the system according to the common apprehension of it is some excuse for such a conduct, this is the sole cause that makes men so extremely fond of mending the divine plan, which stands indeed in great need of being made much better than they imagine it. This disposition will never cease till the ground thereof is abolished by an entire removal of the false as well as contracted notion it is founded on; the divine council needs only to be rightly understood in order to be justified and admired as it is, but unhappily the final decree of Heaven has, like the original, been seen thro' a wrong medium, whereby the scheme of Providence has appeared over-run with mischief, and from beginning to end a spectre. Not only the good thereof has seemed very diminutive to what it will be, but the evil been increased and magnified beyond measure; in which case it is no wonder that men were for

changing the design, and as they saw not in any shape what it was, were for making it what it could not be.

I should not have entered so largely into this dispute at present, if the suggestion set up to account for the free-gift coming upon all to justification of life, Christ being the Saviour of the world, and the propitiation for the sins of the whole world had not obstructed the fundamental principle of our hypothesis, viz. that the present state after the fall was entirely an effect of Redemption. Our enquiry commences with the presumption of this from Reason, and terminates in the deduction of it from Revelation, which I had no expectation of in the beginning; so that however just the principle may be, it has need to be well established on all sides, as very little use has hitherto been made of it to explain the general doctrines of Redemption, much less the particular texts of Scripture relating to this. If there be any merit in the hypothesis, I think its originality cannot

cannot be questioned ; I do not say I have never met with the supposition in any others, tho' it first occurred to me from my own reflection ; there are some faint traces of it to be found in Dr. Clarke and Bishop Sherlock, which while they shew that these two great men were not wholly void of the notion and that I have not pursued therein a dream entirely of my own imagination, are at the same time as convincing proofs of the little improvement that they made of it or impresson that it had upon them. The former says, " God threatened Adam that in the day he eat of the forbidden fruit he should surely die ; and had that threat been immediately executed, 'tis plain that his posterity could have had no being at all, and as plain that no injustice could have been thereby done to them who never were. But the mercy of God granted Adam a reprieve, and instead of dying immediately he only became subject to mortality by his sin. In which case since it was meerly an effect of God's mercy to Adam to permit us a possibility

possibility of beginning to live, it cannot be thought unjust that he should appoint us to die. Especially since that death, which was introduced by Adam, (and whatever would have been the consequences of it in a future state) was as universally removed by the second Adam who is the Lord from Heaven, as it spread by the transgression of the first." [See the fourteenth of Seventeen Sermons, preached on several occasions.]

Nothing can be more plainly asserted than the principle alluded to is in the beginning of this passage, but what a strange fatality was it to suppose any possible consequences of the death introduced by Adam if there had not been a Redemption, in the very instant he was urging that this life would have never been at all but by the means of it! How could there be any future state without the present, or effect of mortality without men being ever born to it? He had
no

no sooner proposed the point in question than he forgot it, and tho' it cannot be said that he never dreamt of it, yet it may that it was no better than a dream with him.

The influence of this hypothesis was more lasting upon Bishop Sherlock, for he uniformly adheres to it throughout his Discourses upon Prophecy, and in his Appendix to them advances further in it than any man I have ever met with. He made no other application of it, however, than to account for the grace of our deliverance, and had no notion of explaining the satisfaction by it; nothing was farther from his imagination than that this is capable of any explanation to our present faculties in itself. Neither was he always consistent with regard to grace, for tho' he says in the Appendix that thro' mercy and for the sake of shewing mercy the present world subsists, that God would have never suffered it to be filled with weak miserable creatures

creatures had he not intended them for
 this, and that otherwise it would have
 been far better to put an end to two
 wretched lives than continue them for
 the propagation of wickedness and misery
 to a thousand generations, &c; yet in
 the four volumes of his sermons he goes
 quite on the contrary supposition, of which
 I shall give the following specimen at
 length. "Were we to consider one per-
 "son as our Creator and another as our
 "Redeemer, it would be extremely to the
 "diminution of the honour and regard due
 "to the Creator; inasmuch as the blessing
 "of Redemption would greatly outweigh
 "the benefit of creation, and it would be
 "natural to prefer the love that delivered
 "us from the evils and miseries of the
 "world to that which placed us in them.
 "In the daily service of our Church we
 "praise God for creating and preserving us,
 "but above all for his inestimable love in
 "the Redemption; which is very con-
 "sistent with respect to one benefactor
 "who both made and redeemed us, but
 "had

“had any other hand redeemed us such
 “expression of gratitude to him would
 “have reflected dishonour upon the Cre-
 “ator.” [Vol. I. disc. ii. page 77.] The
 inconsistency of this, with what he had
 said in his Appendix, is too obvious to
 be enlarged upon, and altogether as great
 as that of Dr. Clarke, the only difference
 is that the contradiction is not advanced
 in the same breath.

The same error and confusion has pre-
 vailed with regard to another branch of
 our hypothesis that is very nearly con-
 nected with this, viz. that the law was
 totally dispensed with, not only as to
 future but to present punishment, and
 that temporal death was no more inflicted
 than eternal in pursuance of it. That
 all the measures ordained on the trans-
 gression of it are necessary to the corrup-
 tion of our being, and that to immortalize
 man in his present state would not have
 been for his happiness, but on the con-
 trary an increase and perpetuation of evil

has been observed by many. There are very few, however, that have thought of resolving the Divine conduct wholly notwithstanding into necessity of nature in exclusion of the law ; even they who have had the best notion of the former have attributed the event of things entirely to the latter, and made death as much a judicial punishment as if there were no other account to be given of it ; or as if nothing but the execution of the law could be supposed, and there were no such thing as a Redemption. Of this a specimen has been lately given in Dean Sherlock sufficient to preclude the necessity of any further reference.

There are some, indeed, who have maintained that there is not any circumstance annexed to the present state but what its own exigency requires, and that there is no occasion for recurring to the breach of any original law to account for death ; since it is so essential in itself to nature and man must die according to the due
course

course of things, independant of any particular law whatever. They who asserted this, however, were such as maintained mortality the original condition of our being, and admitted not any disadvantage of a fall or benefit of Redemption; they did not think of explaining the necessity of original judgment, grace, or satisfaction by it but denied there is any truth in either. I think, I need not say much to prove that my account is very different from theirs.

As to the solution of sin and evil with the advantage of our fall thro' Redemption to the blessed angels, which I have pursued to so great a length, the best notion I have found of this is in the notes of the late Bishop of Carlisle upon Archbishop King, tho' his Lordship prefers an opposite hypothesis. With regard to what he has in common with me I saw nothing of it till I had nearly finished my own scheme, and as to the difference that subsists between us this

has been fully enlarged upon; I shall only add that, whatever it may be, I entertain the utmost reverence for his Lordship, and think that he has made the best improvements on the right plan for the solution of evil, tho' he has derogated in the most extraordinary manner from it.

I must now take my leave of the public for the present, trusting that all due allowance will be made for the liberty I have taken with so many great authorities and the improvement I have professed to make upon them. Every man should be well satisfied himself with what he offers to the world, and has not only a right to the freedom of his own opinion, but also to set forth any apparent advantage of it over that of others in the best light he can; there may not be presumption in differing from the greatest judges, but without it sometimes there would be no possibility of improvement. All that is indispensably to be required of
any

any person is the integrity of his intention, in which case there lies no reproach of self-sufficiency or assurance, whatever may be the event of his endeavours; especially when others are always treated with the respect and allowed the merit that is due to them. As to these particulars I think I can fully justify myself, having aimed at nothing but the pursuit of truth (whether I have found or failed of it) and been as careful to give every man what belonged to him as I have been to claim what I thought my own. I have neither courted orthodoxy nor popularity, neither been moved by regard nor fear of any party or persuasion; but have occasionally encountered and defended every one as truth seemed to require it, endeavouring to maintain faith without superstition and freedom without licentiousness, whatever rocks I have been obliged to steer between in order to avoid extremes on all sides. The success must be determined by the public, but

I

I think the uprightness and fortitude of the enterprize cannot easily be questioned; which, whatever may be the consequence, will entitle me to a favourable allowance in the breast of equitable judges.

After this apology for the design, it will be proper to prefer some for the execution, which may stand in greater need of it; but however the latter may fall short of what it should be, I hope it will in general serve to convey my meaning with tolerable propriety and exactness. I may have sometimes dwelt too much on one thing, too little on another; now and then perhaps have wandered out of the road, or frequented the same part of it too often; but whatever superfluities or defects, episodes or repetitions there may be, I trust I have not lost sight of the main object, and that indulgence will be granted for imperfections of this kind from the very nature of the subject. Whoever attempt to strike out a new course

course are much more liable to go to and fro, to travel over the same ground and out of the right direction, than they who propose nothing but to pursue a beaten, hackneyed road, every step of which lies plain before them. If the former do not miss their way so as to loose the end of their expedition, some deviations and returns to the same point must be excused; new schemes are not so easy to be explained as the old, but must be diffusively displayed and variously represented before they can be made familiar. There is always something aukward in the first attempts toward them, and perhaps they never are set forth to so much advantage by the inventor as by the persons that come after him; who have nothing to do but to retrench excrescences, supply deficiencies and methodize things in a better manner. If due allowance be made for this (which is almost unavoidable to original composition) I hope notwithstanding all the faults the foregoing Treatise may be

be charged with, it will be acknowledged
at least, to contain some observations that
are worthy of attention and capable of
improvement in other hands.



F I N I S.

